### DEPENDENCY

A STUDY OF THEORY AND CAUSES

A Thesis Presented for the Degree of Master of Arts

by

Mervin A. Durea, A.B.

# THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

1924

Approved by:

Henry H. Godelund

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Chapter	I.	Introductory: General Statement of the Problem.
Chapter	II.	General Discussion of Dependency as a Social Problem
Chapter	III.	Tentative Theory of Dependency
Chapter	IV.	Biological Aspects of DependencyPpg.81
Chapter	۷.	The Experimental InvestigationPpg.93
Chapter	VI.	General SummaryPpg.138

\*\*\*\*\*

•

4

.

### FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

It is not without some knowledge of its incompleteness, that the present study is submitted. The writer, even though he may appear to be dogmatic, has simply followed a line of conviction having its outgrowth from empirical observation and study of many types of dependent children. Further, this conviction has been strengthened by data from researches in other types of problems, differing in phase, but strongly analogous to the present research. These are fully discussed in the later portions of this work.

If the present study raises many questions in regard to dependency, gives some inspiration or suggestion for further research, or in any manner blazes the trail so that others interested in dependency will profit by the mistakes and the experience of the writer, it will have served its purpose.

Thanks are due to many who have assisted materially in this effort. Sincere appreciation is due Mr. Harry H.Howett and his staff of workers for assistance in gathering follow-up data on the cases of the Division of Charities. The appreciation of the writer is extended to the authorities of the Bureau of Juvenile Research for the use of their files in the obtaining of psychological data. Thanks are due to Dr. Henry H.Goddard and Dr. Edgar A. Doll for direction, inspiration and assistance in carrying out the present study to completion. Lastly, to all others who, by suggestion, encouragement or criticism have aided the writer, sincere thanks are extended.

THE AUTHOR

Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio August 25, 1924.

#### CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.

One of the three objects specified in Section 1832 of the Ohio General Code, which act established the Ohio Board of Administration\*, is "To promote the study of the causes of dependency and delinquency, and of mental, moral and physical defects, with a view to cure and ultimate prevention". Section 1841-2 states that this same Board "shall provide and maintain a "bureau of juvenile research", and shall employ competent persons to have charge of such bureau and to conduct investigations".

As to the specific function of this Bureau, this is stated in Section 1841-3. This section provides that The Ohio Board of Administration may assign the children committed to its guardianship to the Bureau of Juvenile Research for the purpose of mental, physical and other examination, inquiry or treatment for such period of time as the Board may deem necessary. This section further provides that the Board may transfer any minor in its custody to the Bureau for observation, treatment and so on.

Under this same Board of Administration functions the Ohio Board of State Charities. One of the duties of this

-1---

<sup>\*</sup> Under the reorganization brought about by Governor Harry L. Davis, the Ohio Board of Administration became the Department of Public Welfare, and the Ohio Board of State Charities became the Division of Charities. In the future chapters of this study, when mention is made of either of these organifations, reference will be made by the reorganization name.

agency as prescribed in Section 1352-3 is to receive as its wards such dependent or neglected minors as may be committed to it by the Juvenile Court or other agencies, allowed by law to receive indigent children. The Board of State //Charities then becomes responsible for the placement, maintainance, and care of these children.

As a functional unit of the Ohio Board of Administration, the Bureau of Juvenile Research very early after its establishment began to examine those children that had come to the attention of the authorities of the Ohio Board of State Charities. The general purpose of such examination was to lend what assistance was possible in the different types of placement problems with which the Ohio Board of State Charities was confronted. In the majority of cases the examination consisted of an individual psychological study. In cases where specific problems were involved, the child was resident at the Bureau for a period of from ten days to two weeks, so that observation was added to the psychological study.

Of course when possible the psychological study was synthesized with family history, developmental history, medical findings, etc., but this was not at all times obtainable at the time the separate studies were being made, so that the major emphasis in each case was usually from the standpoint of the psychological examination.

In the period of time between the early examinations and the time at which this study was made several hundred cases

- 2 -

had been examined at the Bureau. It is to be regretted that in the program of handling dependent children the Bureau and the Ohio Board of State Charities were not in closer touch with each other, so that follow-up work could be done on each case, and results of the psychological examination checked against the actual experience with the wards of the Ohio Board of State Charities under placement. The Bureau of Juvenile Research and the Ohio Board of State Charities functioned as separate units of the Ohio Board of Administration without very close coordination of work. Undoubtedly, if these agencies had been able to function more cooperatively, much could have been ascertained with regard to the factors that are involved in the successful placement of dependent children. As it is, working more or less independently of each other, the methods have been hit or miss on the part of both agencies, and while each agency has been able to accumulate a large body of information, this information has not been correlated in any way.

The present study is undertaken for the purpose of correlating the facts and observations made in the psychological study of dependent children, with the facts of the child's subsequent behavior under placement.

It is hoped that by approaching the problem from this angle that it will be possible to work out a syndrome of factors, psychological, social, and others, which will determins whether or not, given other things equal, a dependent

- 3 -

child can be successfully placed. In other words, the present study purposits to ascertain whether there are specific factors that will determine whether a child who becomes a dependent ward of the State can be placed or should have other types of care, as institutional, penal and so forth.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Throckmorton, A. H. General Code of the State of Ohio, 1921.

### CHAPTER II

GENERAL DISCUSSION OF DEPENDENCY AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM\*.

As used in the present chapter the term "dependency" is applied in a very general sense. For our present purposes we may use the definition propounded by Henderson(1) that dependents are "those who, from any cause, exist by means supplied by the voluntary acts of the community. by gifts from public funds or private sources." This definition would imply not only the dependent as used in the specific. technical sense, but would also embody cases of poverty and To draw a cleavage line between the categories, pauperism. poverty, pauserism and dependency is exceedingly difficult. In a sense all are dependents, and yet the terms as used separately have acquired certain technical connotations. Notwithstanding this confusion of terms, the factors basic in the causes of these problems are very intimatedy related and no one category can be discussed independently of the other.

Later in our study we will differentiate on the basis of our data, the specific classification of dependency with which we are dealing.

\* The writer is indebted to Dr. John L. Gillin's recent book "Poverty and Dependency" for a large amount of the material in this chapter. It is used with some modification.

- 5 -

### INTRODUCTION.

With the change from tribal to civil form of society came the urgency to individualism. As long as society was a group of blood relatives, a spirit of communism prevailed. Individual capacity was used for the advantage of all members, while individual incapacity, if it was not ruthlessly eliminated shared in the welfare of all. Group solidarity and mutual aid were necessary to survive in conflict with unconquered Nature and hostile groups. Wealth was largely the fruits of Nature which the individual had not learned to appropriate to himself.

Several factors, however, arose that disrupted this state of affairs. Population increased, media of exchange were invented, growth in needs to be satisfied took place, animals became domesticated and were appropriated to individual, family and small group usage, agriculture developed with a consequent demand for fertile land, prestige grew and certain scarce articles were appropriated by individuals for purposes of social distinction, all of which with a consequent growth of commercial and other forms of communication brought about a strain upon old tribal relationships, which in the course of time broke them down and introduced a form of social organization entirely different from the homogeneity of the tribe.

Hence, class distinctions developed. Control of

both luxuries and necessities made appearance. On the one hand there were those who were individually wealthy; on the other, arose individual poverty.

One might even state that the process was one of survival of the fit. Whereas, under the tribal organization the social flotsam had been either provided for or eliminated after the disruption of the tribal society, with the previously mentioned urgency upon individualism, those who were individual incapacitates became a social problem. Hence, we have what is known by varying terms as, poverty, pauperism, or dependency.

Briefly then, such social phenomena are the results of a growingly complex civiligation. As long as group ownership and interest prevailed there were no problems. Ciwil organization calls for greater individual adjustment, responsibility and initiative. Those who were so lacking in capacity could not survive and as a result became, with maturing civilization, social dependents. What had been the property of the group was exploited for the advantage of the few. Unequal capacity meant inequality or absence of ability to accumulate individual wealth. Economic inequalities developed. With the individual ownership of property came a break-down of the common responsibility for the welfare of the group as a whole.

- 7 -

APPROACH TO THE PROBLEN OF DEPENDENCY.

Historically there are four methods of approach to the problem of dependency. We may term these, (1) Sympathetic motive, (2) religious motive, (3) political motive, and (4) the social motive.

The sympathetic motive in the effort to alleviate conditions of distress in the social group was palpably crude In every group there were the thoughtful, and these endeavored to formulate a theory as to the proper method of treating the poor. In every society distress evoked response from certain sympathetic individuals. This reaction toward the distressed had no specific organization or rationale, yet it served to meet the immediate needs of the unfortunate.

Primitive man was very devout in matters of religion. It was an easy step from the sympathetic motive to the religious motive in relieving distress and misfortune. To please God was the a priori assumption of the primitive religious man. And since the sympathetic motive was an impulse to help, religion readily annexed the relief of poverty to its realm, and charity became an act well pleasing to God.

As soon as society had developed to the point where the favor of the individual was sought, opportunity arose for the crafty politician to win favor by means of

- 8 -

largesses to the needy. In the decadent days of Rome this took the form of corn and games. With the ward politician it takes the form of Thanksgiving turkeys and gifts in time of need to faithful followers. Thus, the political motive arose. The political motive corrupted the foundations of democracy.

None of the motives for relief of distress which have been previously mentioned tended to bring an adequate solution to the problem. By indiscriminate giving the individual was not made independent, but rather when aid assumed the nature of almsgiving both the individual and society were demoralized. Hence, to prevent demoralization, to promote independence and general welfare the social motive in aid for the needy arose. The sympathetic motive had served well its purpose in which giver and recipient were well known to each other, and connected by either blood-ties or long fellowship in the community, but it worked in a derogatory manner to those whose circumstances and history were unknown. It produced the phenomena of confirmed mendicancy. Where the circumstances and history of the individual were unknown it was difficult to distinguish between those actually distressed and the impostor. Mendicancy was sanctified under the religious motive for those who wished to do penance for sin.

Each of these motives had failed in turn to curb or prevent pauperism, poverty and other social problems.

- 9 -

It was with the hope that, wherein other motives had failed, the social motive would succeed, that this latter movement had its rise.

The problem of poverty, pauperism and dependency is approached in these modern days by the investigational method. Effort is made, not only to help immediate needs, but to ascertain causes of these phenomena with view to ultimate prevention. Something of the seeming futility of this, at least as ameliorative programs are now directed, will be shown in later portions of this study. Intelligently directed effort to alleviate dependency must carry with it the idea of ascertaining and fathoming the antecedents of this phenomenon. In this way and only this can the individual be given a true sense of social responsibility.

EXPLANATIONS AND CONDITIONS OF DEPENDENCY.

We have reviewed in an introductory way the changes in the social organizations which have given to us the social phenomenon of dependency. Also we have reviewed the methods of approach in the solution of the problem. It is impowsible within the limits of the present study to review all explanations in detail. What we shall try to do is to anticipate those factors, in a very general way, that are apropos to the present study. Historically, there are some explanations which bear some resemblance to the efforts made by certain groups even in this modern day.

Primitive man was essentially a religious being. Nature to him was animistic. He must court the favor of

. 10 -

Nature. At one time Nature was choleric, at other times beneficient. Hence, if when the individual or the group suffered this Deity was displeased. It was most natural that this explanation should carry over as an explanation of dependency or other social problems. Hebrew literature is especially characterized by the religious explanation. However, the later writings of the Prophets show that they saw poverty as a social injustice. Even though present day explanations are more refined there is still extant the belief that sin or unworthiness is the cause of poverty. However, with the birth of natural science, there has been an effort to connect sin with some violation of natural law. On the other hand, social injustice as an explanation has developed with the evolution of society.

Aside from the religious explanation of dependency there arose very early a quasi-hereditary theory. It is possible that nomadic shepherds had in a crude way become familiar with certain laws of heredity, so that it was known that characteristics were transmitted. Again, we find reference to the fact that, "the sins of the father are visited upon the children even to the third and fourth generation." With the development of modern science and the scientific theory of bredity a new impetus was given to the doctrine that explains poverty on the basis of inheritance. Defects were inherited and defects were the cause of poverty. Thus, Herbert Spencer believed that the poor should be left alone.

- 11 -

In the struggle for existence the weak would be eliminated while the strong would perpetuate themselves. Spencer assumed that the weak were hereditarily so, and the only solution for them was elimination. Modern theories of heredity do not maintain that poverty specifically is inherited, but emphasis is placed upon those characteristics that tend to produce poverty. While there is little doubt that inheritance does play an important role as an explanation of poverty it is exceedingly far-fetched to ascribe this as the only reason for the existence of such a social phenomenon

In the last fifty years the problem of poverty has been attacked from many different standpoints. Gillin (2) has reviewed these and listed them briefly under the two different heads as, explanations of poverty on the basis of individual fault, and explanations of poverty on the basis of economic maladjustment.

As to individual fault, the causes range from sinfulness, personal unworthiness, laziness to alcoholism, drugs and many others.

Under economic maladjustment are listed the theory of Karl Marx which charges that capital gives to labor only a dubsistence wage; Henry George's theory of "single tax"; Malthus' theory that the population tends to outrun food supply--and ad infinitum.

Both of these categories are eschewed by Gillin as being scientific makeshifts. In many of these theories there

- 12 -

may be some truth, but in the case of the individual's failure to attain independence, there are conditions either in himself which are inherited or which are in the conditions surrounding him and so affect him that he becomes destitute. With reference to economic maladjustment, while having an element of truth, these theories do not, as specifically stated, fully explain poverty, but must be taken in conjunction with other facts. The conviction has grown up that no one theory is fully explanatory of conditions of poverty. Physical environment, specific defects, difference between natural endowment, social and economic maladjustments et cetera must all be considered. Thus, modern theory as to causes of poverty are decidedly away from one-sided to many-sided explanations.

# SPECIFIC CONDITIONS OF DEPENDENCY: PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND HEREDITARY INCAPACITY.

We have called attention to some general explanations of the phenomenon of dependency. It will be noted that these explanations show a range from the very crude characterized by primitive society to the more complex characterized by that of a civilization of higher order. Briefly then, explanations have partaken of the characteristics of the state of social evolution from the very crude to the very complex. Probably the one factor which most influenced modern explanations of the phenomenon of dependency was the advent of natural science. From the speculative aspect of explaining dependency the influence of natural science emphasized certain differential factors which have been touched upon, but which need further elucidation, It is the purpose of the author at this juncture to review factors in the physical environment and hereditary factors that are the purported causal conditions of dependency.

Under physical factors in the environment are listed such items as, poor natural resources, climate, sudden climatic changes, natural pests, natural cataolysms, diseases, and the like.

While it seems plausible that such factors have some relation as causes of dependency, yet the data are of doubtful value because as yet no statistical researches have been conducted which show the importance of these factors. In many cases such explanations are complicated with other factors so that it becomes difficult which to assign as a primary or secondary cause of dependency. For example, on the question of poor natural resources, it is questionable if this is not complicated with such factors as intelligence, poor judgment in selection of resources and what not. It would seem from certain data which are available that a close correlation exists between the economic status, as judged from the poorness or richness of resources, and intelligence. Hence, it it as plausible to assign intelligence as the fundamental cause of the individual making a selection of poor natural environment and at once the fundamental cause of dependency,

- 14 -

as it is to assign poor natural resources as the fundamental cause of the phenomenon. As yet this is an unsolved problem, but gives some basis for further research. Later in our study some data are offered on this point.

There is little doubt but that economic welfare is affected by unfavorable climates, and that such factors as destructive pests (the cotton boll weevil, for example) have an important place in determining economic welfare, but it is difficult to determine to what extent these are influential, so that, in the absence of statistics, any definite statement or evaluation of such causal factors would partake of the nature of conjecture.

On the other hand, considerable material is available on the effect of inheritance upon dependency. We know that mental traits are hereditable. Even the pioneer work of Galton (3) and Woods (4) shows this, the former showing that the qualities which go to make up genius are hereditary; the latter in his study of royalty showing that achievement runs in families. These studies show that <u>ability</u> is inherited in a rather striking way. Is it possible then that <u>lack</u> of ability or lack of capacity for the important work of life is also inherited? From all evidence available it would seem that the answer must be in the affirmative.

Many studies have been made of inherited inferiority in families. The earlier studies simply pointed out that family progenitors possessed certain characters and that

- 15 -

the offspring had also the same traits. One of the first studies was by Dugdale (5) of a degenerate pauper family called the Jukes. Although the results are somewhat vitiated by the fact that Dugdale assumes that poverty and crime are inherited as entities, yet the study shows very strikingly how when a weakness is handed down in ever-increasing proportions when inbreeding occurred, a corresponding increase in pauperism resulted. Estabrook (18) in a very recent study of the Jukes, more elaborate and extensive than that of Dugdale, concludes from his data that pauperism is a definite indication of weakness, both physical and mental.

In 1892, Charles Booth (6) made a study of pauperism in London. The study is simply a collection of stories of cases which have been relieved over a period of years. Although statistically valueless, these stories show how the tendency to laziness, immorality, and irregular employment, with their resulting recourse to the public poor relief authorities, run in families. Incapacity runs from father to son or daughter and on down the line, as well as in the kinship.

A recent study by the State Board of Charities in Virginia (7) shows that in some county infirmaries there are as many as for generations of the same family.

Davenport and Estabrook (8) report a study of a degenerate rural community, called the Nam Family in New York State. They investigated 1,795 in the kindred. They studied the trait of indolence in this group. They say concerning the results of their study, "Our data afford us a number of families where both parents are indolent, others where both are industrious. We have tabulated the two fraternities, 30 in number, derived from two industrious parents, without regard to grandparents. Of a total of 82 known children from such matings, 73, or 90 per cent, are industrious. When, on the other hand, both parents are indolent, no regard being had to grandparents, then out of a total of 34 known children, 26 are unindustrious, or 76.5 per cent."

In order to ascertain whether these Nams were more influenced by heredity than environment, a study of the branch of the family which migrated to Minnesota and had lived there ever since, was made. The authors conclude that even though the new environment was much superior to the old it had no appreciable effect on the migrating portion of the family. The traits reported in the Minnesota portion of the family were identical with those of the New York branch. The data seem to show that it is the inherent mental traits present in the germ-plasm which plays a dominant part in determining the behavior and reactions of individuals.

Studies and references might be multiplied showing how the factor of inferiority or incapacity runs from generation to generation in families.

Among these one might name the Tribe of Ishmael in Indiana. the Hill Folk, the Pineys, the family of Sam

- 17 -

Sixty in Ohio, the Dack Family and so on, all of which show how inborn incapacity runs from generation to generation. However, for the purposes of the present study only one more will be used to substantiate our premise that dependency has to a large extent its genesis in a hereditary incompleteness.

One of the more recent studies of hereditary deficiency has been made by Goddard (9) of a family that he calls the Kallikaks. Goddard concludes that where inherited defect is demonstrable it is a potent factor in the causation of dependency, because those who are inferior do not have the inherited vitality and mind of the sort to manage their own affairs in such a way that they can compete with independent, respectable people around them. It would seem that the foregoing leaves but little doubt that the role of inheritance as a causative influence in dependency is decidedly great. Just how important this role is, is difficult to say, and how important these conditions are as they relate to the specific problem of dependent children, with which the present study is concerned is more difficult to say. Of course, one point which must be considered is that these studies herein presented have been made on groups that have shown for a long period of time a lack of ability to adjust to social expectations. Whether these studies of the seriously handicapped are merely major prototypes of those individuals that are dealt with as childdependents is a question with which later portions of this study is concerned.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN DEPENDENCY.

Gillin maintains that socio-economic factors are far more important than the physical environment or heredity in the cause of dependency. Admitting, perhaps, that there are <u>certain</u> factors in this category that are equal in importance with the aforementioned ones, we do not believe that a general assumption can be made, as to the place that such factors have in the scale of importance. We have already stated our position on the question of the physical environment, but the position of the present study is that dependency holds a very close and important relationship to the germinal factor.

At this juncture a classification of the socioeconomic factors in dependency is in order. They will be discussed critically in following portions of this study.

Classification of Socio-Economic Factors in Dependency.

1. Factors affecting the income.

- A. Death or disability of the bread winner not directly due to industrial conditions.
- B. Adverse industrial conditions such as disease, accident and fatigue due to improperly managed store or factory.
  - 1. Accidents
  - 2. Disease and death
  - 3. Fatigue.

- 19 -

II. Factors affecting both income and expenditure.

A. Labor of women and children.

B. Faulty education.

III. Factors affecting expenditures.

- A. Traditions, customs and habits affecting taste in food and dress, thrift and standard of living.
- B. Ignorance of the elements of domestic economy.
- IV. Maladjustments in the production and distribution of wealth and income.
  - A. Sudden fluctuations in prices.
  - B. Under-production.
  - C. Inequitable distribution of wealth and income.
  - D. Pressure of population on natural resources.
  - E. Inadequate machinery for the adjustment of economic and social relationships in society.

V. Marital relations.

- A. Widowhood.
- B. "Single-blessedness" or celibacy
- C. Divorce
- D. Desertion.
- E. Illegitimacy.

VI. Political maladjustments.

- A. Corruption and influence.
- B. Outgrown laws and methods of administration.
- C. A negative rather than a positive attitude toward delinquents and unfortunates.
- D. Wastefulness in government expenditures.
- E. International maladjustments.

- VII. Unwise philanthropy.
  - A. Extent of poverty and pauperism caused by indiscriminate giving.
  - B. Economic burden of unwise philanthropy.
  - C. Pauperizing influence of bad example.
  - D. Public support of defective classes.
  - E. Beggars and vagrants.
  - F. Effect of indiscriminate giving on the public.
- VIII. Lack of adequate methods of settling industrial disputes.
- IX. Educational system ill adapted to prepare for life and livelihood.
  - A. Abbreviated school life of American children.
  - B. Inadequate education.
  - C. Blind-alley jobs.

Referring to IA in the classification, quite a body of statistical information is available on the instances of preventable and unpreventable diseases and death due to natural causes. These studies for the most part set forth not only the loss to the public exchequer but also to the family and the individual. The chief argument that can be adwanced from these statistics is that much dependency could be eliminated by proper attention to a health program tending to decrease the death and disease rates by preventive measures. Such statistics, however, are difficult to construe. We know that as a general factor death or disability of the

bread-winner due to certain preventable or unpreventable conditions is important. However, we have no absolute measure of this influence. Aside from one statement made by Devine (10) to the effect that seventy-five per cent of the distress which comes to the Charity Organization of New York City is caused immediately by sickness, no estimate has been made as to the importance of factors of natural death and disease. Hence, the amount of influence on dependency must remain conjectural. On IB, statistics show a large number of deaths and disabilities attributed to improperly managed industrial concerns. Also, the disease and death rates in the occupations is higher than the rate for the whole population of the same age group. Fatigue and overstrain, resulting in lowered production and sickness are advanced as reasons for dependency. The same logical conclusion follows on this point as in the one previously discussed. How great is the influence of disease, death and fatigue due to industrial conditions, on the problem of dependency? Statistics do not show. Therefore, the degree of influence is largely No doubt if conditions in industry were one of inference. improved, it would tend to decrease dependency somewhat, but at present the amount of this decrease must remain an unsolved problem.

with reference to IC,D, and E, it is questionable as to whether these conditions that are attributed as primor-

- 22 -

dial factors in the income are not really after all secondary in nature. The factors affecting income are more fundamental. That is, is not the fact that there is unemployment on improper wages simply an indication that a large mass of our unemployed are composed of individuals who form a class unable by a lack of inherent ability to progress beyond a certain point, and who, because of this same lack, receive low wages or wages inadequate for the necessities of life? Some studies to be discussed later seem to show this in a striking way. It would been that dependency can not be attributed primarily to unemployment, low wages, and other such factors, but that the fundamental fact of inherent incapacity for which such phenomena are only criteria, is after all the fundamental cause.

While it may be true that some dependency is due to adverse surroundings of children, again it becomes questionable as to whether this can be assigned as a primary cause. The question is how much of adverse surroundings is to be ascribed to heredity and how much to other factors than inheritance. The present study holds to the idea that in general, surroundings are indicative of the intelligence status of the individual or family.

With reference to IIA and B, criticism can only be indicated. Except in rare instances where the death of the father has necessitated the labor of the mother in order to support the family, the labor of women and children might be taken as an evidence of inadequacy on the part of the father. That is, hereditary incapacity precludes the possibility of an income beyond a certain point. And since it is known that families of those lower in the social strata are most usually larger than those higher in the social scale, this fact with a concomitant poor salary would probably make it necessary for both parents and children to work in order to survive. What the exact relationship of this factor is to dependency is difficult to understand, except to say that for the most part those families that are characterized by labor of women and children represent the types out of which dependents are made.

Faulty education is berated as one of the factors in dependency; that is, the curriculum is unsuited to the after-needs of the individual. This faulty education may be linked either with the home or school. The charge is made that earning capacity is not imparted by these two institutions. Hence, when the individual is thrown on his own resources, he becomes dependent. From two standpoints the argument of faulty education as explanatory of dependency seems defective. It is probable that the problem reduces itself to one of original endowment. If the individual does not profit by school instruction, does the problem not become one of lack of endowment in the individual and not the fault of the school in the proper administration of the curriculum? Again, where it is charged that the home is at fault, do not such homes represent

- 24 -

simply those who do not have capacity? At least these questions are worth consideration.

Headings III and IV necessarily involve a great many factors economic and otherwise that have no logical place in the present study. Perhaps such points as are mentioned bear some relation to the problem of dependency. However. such factors are so complex and so much involved in philosophic discussion of the problem that their value as causes for dependency can not be relied upon. Such matters as domestic economy, production, and distribution of wealth are much involved in theory. No reliable statistics are available on the degree of influence of such factors, and since many of the theories held with relation to distribution of wealth and are in the process of solution, the causal influence of such factors must be viewed more or less casually. Without doubt, all the factors of the marital relation, to which reference is made in heading V, are profoundly significant as conditions of dependency. Some effort has been made to analyze some of these in the present study.

Widowhood is a cause of dependency and operates chiefly in the cases of women and children. No statistics are at present available as to the comportance of this cause. However, widowhood as a cause brings several important considerations to light, based largely on speculation. It is obvious that not all women who are widowed, with their children become partakers of the benovolence of

- 25 -

society. What of the group who do become dependent with widowhood as an apparent cause? The writer has already suggested the possible theory that the so-called causes are for the most part only symptoms of more fundamental factors that are causes of dependency. Briefly, then whether or not a mother with children would become dependent on the death of the father, would depend somewhat on the inherited capacity of this same mother to be responsible for the children. And such a factor would be operative not alone in the case of the mother but also with the father. That is, while not making an a priori assumption. it seems that even the cases of dependency whose apparent cause is widowhood, can generally be traced back to an inherited incapacity of some kind. The potentialities do not exist in these cases to assume responsibility. The easiest method out of a dilemma is sought, which usually results in the children being thrust upon society to support and nurture. The cause of poverty called "single-blessedness" or celibacy based on a study of unmarried dependents among the males and females of almshouses is not worthy of much consideration. Lack of the advantages of normal family life have been advanced as a reason for these who are in a state of "single-blessedness", becoming dependent. Researches and investigations have shown that very large per cents of the inmates of almshouses are defective mentally. It is almost axiomatic

- 26 -

that paupers are paupers because of this incapacity. To assign lack of normal family life as a condition of dependency becomes almost levity!

It is impossible to say definitely how important the role of divorce is as a condition of dependency. It would be necessary in such a discussion to know the facts concerning alimony, provision for the children after divorce and other such facts. Such information is not available. As a direct cause of dependency it is impossible to believe that divorce is a very important one. It is questionable as to whether, in those cases of dependency that are ascribed to divorce, the real cause could not be traced to the general factor of irresponsibility of the divorced couple, due to low inherent capacity. Obviously, in many cases of divorce adequate provision is made for the children. What of those cases where the children become dependent after divorce? Sursly there must be some factor at work which preempts the possibility of the proper responsibility being felt for children by the divorcees, in cases where children become dependent because of divorce. We suggest that this cause is fundamentally incapacity to accept responsibility. Almost the same line of argument might follow with reference to desertion as a condition of dependency. On this point statistics are somewhat enlightening. Of the cases cared for by various relief agencies. Marquis (11) reports the pro-

- 27 -

portion due to desertion of the husband and father varied from 10 per cent for the Provident Association to 50 per cent at the day nursery at the Institution Church. Devine reports on 5,000 cases known to the Charity Organization Society for years 1906 to 1908. Of this number exactly 10 per cent were deserted wives. In 1916 a somewhat similar study was made on wives. For the last year the same organization reports 11.7 per cent of deserted wives. Brandt (12) finds that the reports of charitable organizations show that of the total number of families in their charge, from 7 to 13 per cent are deserted families, that one-fourth of the committments of children to institutions in New York City are attributed to desertion. It is clear that in desertion, there is an important cause of dependency. But again, as we have heretofore urged, this fact in itself can not be taken with too much credence. There is no reason to believe that desertion in itself is the all important factor, inasmuch as the per cent of those deserted, and who subsequently become dependent, is relatively small. As has been done previously in other connections, we advance the point that desertion is in all probability one of the primary symptoms of an inferior stock, and does not represent fundamentally a cause of dependency. Moreover, if it were possible to investigate the heredity and intelligence status of those who become dependent because of desertion, it is highly probable that most cases

- 28 -

would be found to be that of general incapacity.

Illegitimacy as a cause of dependency is another uncertain quantity. Wooley and Weidensall (13) report a study on unmarried mothers coming to the Cincinnati General Hospital. Tests of two series show that not more than 20 per cent of the unmarried mothers can be safely pronounced normal. Of the married mothers about 50 per cent can be so considered. From 40 to 45 per cent of the unmarried mothers are without question so low grade mentally as to make life under institution care the only happy one for themselves and the most economical and the only safe arrangement for society.

Bowen (14) made a study from the records of the Court of Domestic Relations in Chicago for the Juvenile Protective Association of 419 cases of mothers of illegitimate children. Of these girls one-third were house-keepers, one-fifth factory workers, one-tenth hotel workers, one-tenth tailoresses, seamstresses or milliners, and 6 per cent were laundresses. Before their trouble, in 216 cases investigated, less than 3 per cent received \$12 a week, and 92 per cent less than \$12 a week. The average wage was \$6.75.

In view of the correlation between intelligence status and occupation, salary, and other criteria of economic status it seems fairly obvious that the aforementioned group would represent those who are decidedly inferior in intelligence or in native capacity. The study of Wooley and Weidensall strongly substantiates the point that illegitimacy bears a close rela-

- 29 -

tionship to native capacity, namely, the per cent of those who are guilty of illegitimacy tends to increase as native endowment decreases.

With these facts in hand it seems plausible to argue that the chief condition of dependency even in instances where illegitimacy is assigned would be incapacity.

Under the general heading of political maladjustments are grouped such factors as corruption and influence in politics, and so on. As with many other facts such as these, the significance of such points is exceedingly hard to measure. They are very general in nature, and are facts that affect the whole of group life without having specific relation to particular problems such as dependency. Government in modern society is supposed to be in the interest of all the people. Where there are phenomena that prohibit the most efficient working of the democratic ideals, then the effect upon efficiency is sure to bring problems such as dependency. However, it is a mooted question as to whether or not the relation of such factors as are mentioned in heading VI bear directly on dependency. Where there are prevalent such factors as corruption, antiquated laws, wastefulness in running the government and so forth. it would seem that those who succumb to these forces represent after all a group whose survival would only be lengthened in the absence of such forces. In other words, political maladjust-

- 30 -

ments are merely precipitating causes making for an earlier state of dependency than would follow under normal circumstances.

Apropos to heading VII, it is difficult to state how much the problem of dependency relates itself to indiscriminate giving. There are two influences that work in this respect. First, how many of those who are dependent have become habitually so through indiscriminate methods of relief, and because they have sought the easiest means of living, namely, playing on the gullibility of society? Second, how many are made dependent by reason of the economic burden of taxation for relief, who might otherwise be independent if freed from this burden? In answer to our first query, it is unbelievable that the number who willingly lead a parasitic life of dependency would be at all large unless there is a defect of more fundamental nature. Self-respect follows capacity, and it might be argued that where the individual so lacks this element as to prey on the benovolence of society, he probably falls in the incapacitated group.

Of course, experience shows that where relief is administered in a scientific fashion, there is a noticeable decrease in dependency. This is substantiated by the experience of Indiana. For the year 1895, before the reform of the Indiana public relief system, the overseers of the townships of Indiana spent \$630,168. Twelve years later,

- 31 -

for the year 1907, after scientific methods of relief had been adopted by private agencies, the overseers were spending but \$227,304. In 1897, one out of every 31 of the inhabitants of the state were receiving public poor relief; ten years later only one out of every 72 were receiving such aid, while ten years later, there was not a county in the state where one in 30 of the inhabitants were receiving relief.

Such findings would seem to argue against our first contention that those who prey on the benevolence of society are necessarily incapacitated. However, these statistics do not tell the whole possible story. Undoubtedly, scientific methods of giving would reduce somewhat the expenditures for relief, and the number who receive relief. But one must look upon such findings with a certain degree of skepticism for no other reason than that the purpose of most public efforts in behalf of any movement is to reduce expenses and make the showing as favorable as possible. A reduction of more than 50 per cent in expenditures for relief within a space of 12 years is rather astounding. What is true of expenditures is also true of the proportional decrease in the population who were receiving public aid. And yet nothing is said of thos who had formerly received relief. They were procreating their kind just the same. The population under normal conditions of those who were

ģ

- 32 -
recipients would not have decreased in 12 years. What provision had been made for them? Nothing short of a cataclysm could have made such a marked change in the population of dependents, so that such a disproportionate decrease in the number receiving relief could be noticed. Hence, in order to interpret such statistics correctly, one would have to know what provision had been made for those who, under scientific methods of administering relief, were not longer dependent, Finally, we believe, if such data were available, that as far as the number of those who are potentially dependent is concerned, there would be no appreciable decrease, and the fact of having been once dependent on society would be a criterion of a certain incapacity which the social statistics in this case do not show.

There is existent in this classification of conditions, two that might be called borderline factors. We have advanced the query as to how many of those who are dependent under the economic burden resulting from unwise philanthropy would become independent if relieved of this burden. Further, how much effect does the example of one person receiving public aid affect another. Our contention is that the measurable difference between these two classes and those who actually receive aid is very slight. With an inherited weakness of make-up, all that is needed in either dase is a precipitating cause, and such ones that areon the border-line of dependency usually represent those of defective heredity who would take any excuse to get along with least effort, which would mean that they would become public burdens or dependents.

With reference to defectives, beggars and vagrants, these probably fall in the categories that we have previously mentioned, vis., incapacitates. Further in our study some statistics are quoted on this point which shows that the unemployed are very usually below normal in intelligence. On the question of defectives, society can have no quarrel. Enough has been said to show that not only inside, but also outside of an institution deficiency in any amount probably goes hand-in-hand with dependency. Therefore, until there is an improvement in the eugenical program. this condition will continue to exist. Heading VIII can be dismissed with a word as a wholly uncertain assumption. Dependency is a permanent social phenomenon. Labor and industrial disputes while having some effect on temporary conditions of the people in a certain locality are only effective as long as such disputes obtain. and are not contributory to the permanent phenomenon known as dependency.

Much stress has been placed upon our educational system as a condition of dependency. The school life of the American child is too short, the curricula per se do not prepare children for the needs of life, many who

- 34 -

leave school are inadequately educated, and so it goes that the modern school system comes in for its share of blame as being a responsible factor in dependency. Davis (15) says, "Much of the failure and disappointment in life, and possibly much of the crime that abounds may be attributed to the fact that so large a portion of our youth go out from our schools imperfectly prepared to meet the demands of the world in which they find themselves compelled to make some kind of a living."

"From 50 to 75 per cent of the pupils leave high school before finishing. Fifty per cent of those who finish the eighth grade or reach the end of the time for which they are subject to the compulsory attendance laws never enter the high school."

"With approximately 90 per cent of those who enter the first grade dropping out before the year of graduation from the high school there must be some real and practical reason for their deliberate action. While many of them leave for causes beyond their control, my observation and investigation show that fully 60 per cent of those who leave the high school do so because it does not offer them what, in their opinion and experience, they need for the work that they desire to enter or feel that they are called to do."

Perhaps the educational system is guilty in not providing adequately for a longer educational term for its children, losing contact with them at too early an age,

. 35 -

and sending them into life to become dependent. Perhaps the school does not provide the type of training necessary to the individual life needs of its pupils. Perhaps many of those who leave school do find their way to blind-alley jobs in which they remain permanently, with no chance for promotion or better salary, later raising a family, and ultimately becoming dependent.

But there is another side to the picture. How many of those who drop out do so not because of the fault of the school or curriculum but because they reach their academic or educational limit due to no other factor than lack of ability or inherent incapacity? Granting that the school and curriculum may be at fault in not yet providing adequately for types of training necessary to life, the inquiry might also be made as to how many of the group who drop out and come in the category of those inadequately educated, are really incapacitated for receiving much more education than they receive up to the time they leave school.

As for those who fall in blind-alley jobs, do not those who fall into such a niche simply serve the purpose of showing that there are those individuals who with a certain capacity inevitably gravitate to the job where that capacity is used? In other words, you can not make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Later statistics in this study will show a close correlation between job status and intelligence status, assuming intelligence to be inherited

- 36 -

capacity. Terman (16) says, "Statistics collected in hundreds of cities in the United States show that between a third and a half of the school children fail to progress through the grades at the expected rate; that from 10 to 15 per cent are retaided two years or more; and that 5 to 8 per cent are retarded at least three years. More than 10 percent of the \$400,000,000 annually expended in the United States for school instruction is devoted to reteaching children what they have already been taught but have failed to learn."

In other words then, approximately \$400,000,000 is used on those who by reason of one circumstance or another are unable to progress normally in school. Surely all of this can not be blamed on the laxity of educational methods or the school curriculum. Goddard (17) publishes a table modified from one issued by the United States Department of Education which presents some rather striking results. Table follows on next page. As mentioned the "wages" and "School" figures were recently published by the United States Department of Education, to show the importance of keeping the children in school. Effort was made here to show that the facts of the "school" column account for conditions in the "wages" column. Goddard has added the "intelligence" column.

These statistics were compiled by three separate and distinct agencies, "wages" from the Department of Labor, "School" from the Department of Education, and "intelligence"

- 37 -

WAGES		SCHOOL INTELLIG	INTELLIGENCE			
Of 100 wage earners		Of 100 children Of 1,700,000 s	Of 1,700,000 Soldiers.			
9%	Earn \$150-\$200	13% Leave in 4th Grade, Age 10       10% in "D" Group, M         13       " " 5th " " " 11         14       " " 6th " " 12         27       " " 7th & 8th " 13,14	ental Age 10			
12	" 250-300		"""11			
16	" 350- 600		""12			
31	" 450- 600		""13,14			
68	" less than \$15 per week	67 Do not finish 8th 70 Are below	" " 15			
27	" \$750-\$1000	23       Leave after 8th       161 in "C " Group         10       Attend H.S.       9 " "B" "         2       Graduate H.S.       41 " "A" "         L.5       College       10 " "A" "	n n 15			
8	" 1250		n n 16,17			
2	" over 1250		n n 18,19			

- 38 -

from the Army data. These data are not vitiated by the fact that they were compiled by some individual or agency in order to prove a point.

Even empirically, an inspection of the results of the table shows some rather striking relationships betweeen various factors. It seems that one can assume that at least a major portion of those who fall, for example in "D4" group are identical with those who leave school at a very early age and who also go to make up the class who are potentially low wage exrners. What obtains with the "D-" group would also follow with the other groups. But what of all this in relation to dependency.

We have previously quoted the contention of Davis that abbreviated school life, inadequate education and blindalley jobs are responsible for much dependency. From our data here presented, we maintain that such is not the case. Those who leave school, leave because of inability or incapacity to progress in school. Those who receive inadequate education do so probably because of like reasons, namely, limited ability to achieve. And those who fall into unremunerative blind-alley jobs are simply manifesting the inevitable tendency of those who are incapacitated. They find their level in such jobs, those jobs that suit their limitations.

Look at the matter in whatever perspective one may,

the factor of education cannot be blamed strongly as a factor in dependency. It reduces itself in last analysis to inherent incapacity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

•					
1. Henderson, C.R. Dependents, Defectives, Delinquents, 1901					
2. Gillin, J.L. Poverty and Dependency. 1923					
3. Galten, F. Hereditary Genius. 1871.					
4. Weeds, F.A. Mental and Moral Heredity in Royalty. 1906.					
5. Dugdale, R.L. The Jukes. 1910.					
6. Booth, C. Pauperism and the Endowment of Old Age. 1892					
7. State Board of Charities of Virginia. Mental Defectives in Virginia. 1915.					
8. Davenport, C.B. and Estabrook, A.H. The Nam Family. 1912.					
9. Goddard, H.H. The Kalikak Family, 1912.					
10.Devine, E.T. Misery and Its Causes. 1909					
ll.Marquis,, A Survey of the Extent, Financial and Social Cost of Desertion and Artificially Broken Romes in Kansas City, Missouri. 1915.					
12.Brandt, L. Desertion and Non-support in Family Case Work. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1918.					
13.Wooley, H.T. and Weidensall, J. Proceedings, National Con- ference of Charities and Correction, 1917.					

14. Bowen, L. DeK. A Study of Bastardy Cases. 1914.
15. Davis, \_\_\_\_\_\_ Vocational and Moral Guidance. 1914
16. Terman, L.M. The Measurement of Intelligence. 1916
17. Goddard, H.H. Human Efficiency, and Levels of Intelligence. 1920
18. Estabrook. Arthur H. The Jukes in 1915. 1916.

## CHAPTER III

## TENTATIVE THEORY OF DEPENDENCY.

That the problem of dependency is one which seems inevitably and fundamentally related to the question of human capacity, hereditary inferiority, deficiency of one kind and another, we have tried to show in our general discussion of the problem. No matter what factors have been postulated as the causes of dependency, social, economic, climatic, educational or others, we have been forced to a serious consideration of the hypothesis that dependency is a phenomenon having its rise in a characteristic type of individual of weak native impetus who, either naturally or by reason of precipitating influences revealing this weakness, succumbs to the inevitable and becomes a social problem known as dependency.

Recently a factor known as <u>human efficiency</u> has been discussed freely. No one has attempted to define this term, and it is highly probable that any definitions of the term would differ as widely as the nature of the fields attempting the definition. It is not the purpose of this study to attempt any such definition except in a very general manner. Empirically the lay mind understands the term, and knows that degrees of human efficiency differ in different individuals. It is very clear to the ordinary observer that the individual who digs ditches as a means of livelihood is less efficient than the individual who is an insurance salesman, and so on with whatever other comparisons might be drawn. In other words, as judged by objective criteria one is manifesting the use of far less capacity than the other. The ditch-digger is following that type of work because he has not the capacity for anything else, and so with the insurance salesman.

The contention might be advanced that the ditchdigger is, if he works to his full capacity, as efficient as the insurance-salesman, if he in turn uses all of his capacity. Such a contention would be true, but the point is that the former would be efficient <u>at a lower social</u> <u>level</u>. It is unnecessary in this study to discuss the facts of heredity as they relate to degree or amount of capacity. Researches conducted in the past twenty-five years have established this fact so well that inheritance of capacity, ability, endowment or what-not is a truth which has become almost axiomatic.

If it were not that some of our terms are fairly obvious there might be some cause for confusion. We speak of human efficiency, innate ability, native endowment and many others of this category almost in the same breath and use them synonomously or at least with the implication that they are synonymous. In truth as far as the standpoint

- 43 -

of the present study is concerned, there is no occasion for argument on this point.

In order to make lucid our position in the event that contentions might arise with reference to terminology in the present study, we have adopted the thesis of Goddard (1) with reference to human efficiency. He says, "the chief determiner of human conduct is a unitary mental process which we call intelligence: -----this process is conditioned by a nervous mechanism that is inborn: ---- the degree of efficiency to be attained by that mechanism and the consequent grade of intelligence or mental level of each individual is determined by the kind of chromosomes that come together with the union of the germ cells:---it is but little affected by any later influence except such serious accidents as may destroy part of the mechanism." Hence, in brief then, human efficiency represents the objective method by which the degree of individual capacity is judged; again it might be defined as the behavior evidences, whether social, economic, or educational, that give indications as to the degree of innate capacity which the individual has inherited. Referring again to the case of the ditch-digger, it is evident than that he has less capacity and hence. manifests a lesser degree of human efficiency than the insurance salesman in whom the behavior indications are of a higher order.

- 44 -

To clarify another point that might be mooted. the term general intelligence must be elucidated. Our previous quotation from Goddard makes this point partly clear. However, as connected with human efficiency something must be stated. We have previously suggested by concrete examples how differentiations in innate capacity may be seen or how as seen objectively measured, degrees of human efficiency are manifest. When we speak of general intelligence. the same facts are postulated in this connection as are stated in Goddard's thesis. Further, general intelligence is a measurable entity that can be ascertained as to degree by certain standardized methods known as tests. By these objective methods the innate capacity of the individual is established. As differing from the examples of our previous concrete illustrations of differing capacity. the methods of testing represent a more refined procedure for finding how much capacity for human efficiency the individual possesses. In other words, the measure of this factor known as general intelligence. if once established in the individual makes it possible to prognose how efficient he will be in human activities, social, economic, and educational; in short, what will be his degree of human efficiency.

We come then to our tenet that human efficiency has an inevitable connection with general intelligence. While the thinking public has known this for some time, it has taken the advent and application of scientific technique to the problems of human afficiency to make the correlation of it with general intelligence unequivocal. The publication and popularization of the results of the Army Mental Tests has done much to show the validity of this relationship. Moreover, the uniformity of agreement between the test results and actual experience with the officers and recruits was so great that there has been little doubt left even in the mind of the laity as to the high degree of correlation between mental status and the efficiency with which one orders his life.

Nor has the tendency to connect intelligence in some way with human efficiency been limited alone to the impetus given by the findings of the Army Tests. For a considerable period, before even the work of Binet, certain "mental tests" which had had their genesis in the experimental psychological laboratories were being used in the study of mental deficiency and other social phenomena. These tests were mostly psycho-physical, or applied to specific sense fields, as, vision, taste, smell, memory, association, motor ability, and so on. Such is the nature of the work of Johnson (2), Wylie (3), Kelley (4,5,6,) Norsworthy(7) and others.

However, for any history of the interest and application of intelligence testing methods to human problems, one must go to the source of the movement, Binet, and his

- 46 -

experience with the retarded school children of France. In other words, the interest in intelligence testing or mental testing, as it is commonly understood by the public mind, and the accompanying application of these methods to varied types of human problems, dates from Binet's work.

Of almost equal importance is the subsequent introduction of the Binet system into America by Goddard. and his research findings in the application of the tests to the feeble-minded. Following this, one sees the whole movement gaining momentum so that not only is the interest in intelligence directed alone to the palpably mentally deficient, but the insane, epileptic, criminal and delinquent all in time are made the subjects of intelligence investigation. From the various movements which deal with intelligence as a general factor in human efficiency, the impetus has become more specialized in several directions. Employment psychology has found it possible to incorporate into its technique the methods of testing, both for ascertaining the qualifications of the applicant for a given job or position. and for grading the efficiency of the individuals who are already employed in certain jobs or positions.

Further, educational psychologists have found testing germane to their needs in measuring classroom achievement in certain of the school subjects. Lastly, but by no means least, is the aid which school and clinical psychologists

- 47 -

find in the use, not only of general intelligence tests, but of the more specialized tests, as those for vocational guidande, emotions, and other special factors. Especially is this true, since the possibility of testing by the group method has come into vogue, a fact which makes it possible for the school psychologist to examine and classify an ordinary school system in a fortnight. Then, further, both the school and clinical psychologist are enabled to make use of the specialized forms of tests. While in many ways, the interests of both are common, yet in others their interests are divergent. However, one point must be emphasized. Both are interested in human efficiency and the role that intelligence, whether general or specific, plays in their individual problems and cases. No matter whether the problem being investigated is one of retardation, truancy, delinquency, crime, or psychopathic states, the school or clinical psychologist avails himself of every method, both special and general, for the investigation and solution of that problem, which is, in the last analysis, one of human efficiency.

From the foregoing, several facts are at once evident in the work done thus far intthe relation of human efficiency and intelligence. First, practically all studies in human efficiency have begun with an investigation of these who are from the standpoint of the group of low degree

- 48 -

of human efficiency or perhaps better stated inefficient. This contention seems to follow the contention of somepsychologists that the best way to understand the normal makeup is to study the abnormal. Second, the pendulum of interest has swung from the relation of intelligence as a general factor in human efficiency to the more specific forms of phenomena, both of low and high degree of human efficiency. This has made it necessary to evolve special methods of investigation which the general intelligence examination does not cover. One need only consult the literature on the varied investigations, that have been made on superior children, specific disabilities, causes of delinquency and so forth, to verify this point.

Perhaps there is no field where the investigation of human efficiency by psychological methods would be so fruitful of worth-while results as in the social phenomenon commonly known as <u>dependency</u>. It may be said on this point that investigations by such methods as mentioned is decidedly meager. Some of these will be cited later.

Up to the present point in this chapter we have been principally concerned with making clear certain discrepancies, or confusions that might arise from our intermittent use of such terms as general intelligence, human efficiency, innate capacity, and many others. We have endeavored in a general way to cite instances wherein the

- 49 -

human efficiency of the individual has been a matter of interest to investigators, especially psychologists, using the methods of psychology with reference to those who were obviously low in the scale of efficiency, thus proving at least the efficacy of the method. Reference has been made to specialized methods used in various fields as these methods apply to special problems. The findings of the Army tests have been mentioned and the correlation which these researches show between human efficiency of any degree and the innate capacity or general intelligence of the individual.

## INTELLIGENCE STATUS VS. HUMAN EFFICIENCY.

The proof of our hypothesis that the degree of human efficiency which the individual can show, is possible of prediction from a measurement of his intelligence status, rests of course on the experimental data that can be cited on this point, and the actual correlation that exists between human efficiency status and general intelligence status.

Previous mention has been made of intelligence as it is related to germinal qualities. If when human efficiency is related to general intelligence, it is also related to germinal qualities. Partly from observation and empiricism, but more recently from scientific data, the negro has been regarded as inferior to the white race. The negro has

**- 50** 

never, with few possible exceptions, produced from his race men or women who rated high in human efficiency. Hence, the conclusion is that the germinal qualities of the negro-are inferior to the white, that he can not transmit from parent to offspring the capacities for developing a high order of intelligence and consequently a high degree of human efficiency. On this point, it is a well-known fact. for example. that in the distribution of intelligence in the Army that the modal point of the normal curve of distribution for the negro recruits was in the "D" group, giving a mentality of 10 and 11 years, while the modal point of the same type of curve for white recruits was in the "C" group or a mentality of 13 to 14 years. Pressey and Teter (8) in a study of 187 colored and 2800 white children of the same ages and drawn from the schools of the same area conclude. "The colored children of a given age average at about the age of white children ( in the same city) two years younger." An analysis of the tests shows also that the colored children average below white children of the same age on all of the tests.

Several studies are available which suggest that, when two races of different intellectual expacity are crossed, the offspring are intermediate. They approximate to the superior race according to the proportion of their blood derived from it. Woodworth (9) summarizes the findings of three observers, all of whom, applying intelligence tests to white and colored children, found the intellectual capacity

+ 51 -

of the colored to be inferior to that of the whites. One of the observers divided the colored children into four groups. according to the depth of coloration, and accepting shade of cohor as an indication of the proportion of white blood, concluded that in the more intellectual tests, success increased with the proportion of white blood. In further substantiation of this point, findings are available on two studies of Indians and crossbreeds of white and Indian blood. These studies were made quite independently of each other and by different methods in different places. The Indians studied were all literates, pupils in Indian schools and colleges. The results of the two investigations agree. Garth (10) concludes that the Indians of mixed blood are superior in intellectual capacity to the full-blooded Indians by one full year. Hunter and Sommermier (11) compared white children with Indians of full blood, and with those of one-quarter, one-half, and three-quarters of white blood; they show that there is a large difference in intellectual capacity between the white and the Indian, and that the cross-breed approximate to the white level in proportion to their share of white blood. After considering all possibilities, they cautiously conclude that the difference is probably due to race.

What conclusions are to be drawn from these data? It seems fairly conclusive that where races are inferior that this inferiority persists from parent to offespring

- 52 -

and from generation to generation. The potentialities for developing a degree of human efficiency beyond a certain point remain fairly constant where the racial strain is unaffected by cross-breeding with another race. Further, when a given race is crossed with a superior race the tendency of the hybrid group is to superiority in intelligence status or inherited capacity over the race wherein the pure strain of inferiority exists, and depending on the proportion of the superior stock in the hybrid group, the hybrids tend to approximate the capacity-status of the superior strain. Finally, it seems fairly conclusive that the potentialities for human efficiency are vested in the germinal qualities. One fact must be remembered in connection with racial intelligence: it is probably that if data were available on each separate race, that the variation in capacity would approximate the normal curve of distribution, and, therefore, there would be varying degrees of capacity even within the race.

Is it possible to draw any conclusions from these data as they relate to the problem of dependency? While it is reasoning by analogy to transfer the interpretation of our foregoing data into another field, we believe the similarity of the facts in both cases permit such a procedure. We have seen that a marked continuity exists in the inheritance of capacity and subsequent human efficiency. If we view the dependent as an individual in whom the original, inherited impetus to adapt, to progress, to be independent,

- 53 -

is weak: in whom, because of inferior potentialities, there is not the possibility of showing a high degree of human efficiency, we have a different case in point, but a similar case in kind to those we have previously shown with relation to race. Of course, the argument that social and economic causes are potent in the problem of dependency must not be negated. However, in the discussion in our previous chapter we have, where such existed, tried to show the fallacy of assigning such factors as first causes, always maintaining as a possibility that the primordial cause must be traced to something more fundamental in the individual himself, namely, a natural weakness, innate, inborn and hereditary which makes him, regardless of whatever other cause may be assigned, potentially a dependent. Where social causes existed seemingly as, chief factors in dependency, these have only acted as agents in bringing out the weaknesses of individuals, making them dependent. In this sense the process is a selective one. The weak succumb the strong survive.

Aside from the previous generalizations on the question of dependency, we come now to facts of greater specificity as they bear on the question. It is obvious that all things considered the individual whose salary is \$5000 per year is showing a higher degree of human efficiency than one whose salary is but \$2000. To extend this point somewhat, the former is giving economic evidence of

- 54 -

being the end-product of a strain whose germinal qualities were superior to the latter. This illustration might be carried farther, but it covers the point in hand. If our illustration is true, then one would expect fo find a close correlation between other criteria designative of low or high degree of human efficiency and innate capacity or general intelligence. Probably the chief point of interest would be to know what relationship exists between social status and general intelligence. And this at this point seems especially apropos, since the study of dependency involves also the question of social status.

Decroly and Degand (12) tested 45 children of both sexes in a private school in Brussels. They found that none of the children were below age, nine were at age and the remainder from one to three years above the level for their age. Binet and Simon (13) studied the results of these writers carefully and concluded that the discrepancy in the results between French and Belgian children was due to the fact that the Belgian children came from a private school in Brussels and represented those from well-to-do homes and largely the professional class while Paris children were from a rather poor section of that city. Confirming Decroly's and Degand's work Morel (14) tested a school in a poor section of Paris and compared the results with a school situated in a wealthy The study was on a small scale, only 30 children section.

- 55 -

being taken at random from each school. The following table gives the result of this work:

	Retarded			Advanced		
	2 yr.	l yr.	At Age	l yr	2 yr.	
Unfavored School	1	11	13	4	1	
Favored School	1	, 3	10	10	6	

Whus, 16 out of 30 tested were advanced in the favored school while only 5 were advanced in the unfavored school. The children from the poorer section were on the average about one-fourth year behind the level of their age, while those of the favored school were from one-fourth to one-half year advanced, or a difference of about three-fourths of a year between the two social classes.

In 1910 the teachers of Breslau schools in Germany made a comparative study of different social classes. Demand for a common school for all classes had arisen to replace the Vorschule and the Volkschule. The Volkschule is the elementary public school attended by the children of the laboring and lower business classes, while the Vorschule is attended by children of the higher social classes. In Frussia the children could enter the Gymnasium, which has a 9-year curriculum preparing for the university after 3 years of preparation in the Vorschule, but only after 4 years in the Volkschule. The purpose of this investigation was to find whether the mental maturity of the child, as well as the curriculum, justified this. Hoffman (15) has reported this study. A total of 156 boys were tested from the two schools, Bobertag's modification of the Binet-Simon scale being used. Boys tested were 7 and 9 years of age from the Vorschule. It was found that 9 year Volkschule pupils scored 10 per cent lower than pupils of the same age in the Vorschule, while the 10 year Volkschule boys attained only the average of the 9-year pupils from the better school. The difference in average is due to the fact that the Vorschule pupils did nearly twice as well as the Volkschule pupils of the same age in tests above their age. Tests at age level were passed about equally well by both schools.

Strong (16) conducted a comparative study of white and colored children but in order to make a fair comparison white children in both the city and mill district were tested. Results show that noise of the children of the mill district were above their age level, while 10 per cent of the city children scored above their years. Approximately the same per cent in each district were at level of their age, 84 per cent in city schools, and 81% in mill district schools.

Weintrob and Weintrob (17) report a study of children from three different environments. About 70 child-

- 57 -

ren of both sexes in each group were tested. Group A consisted of children from a school attended by the wealthy class. and who had had travel and other advantages above the average. Group B consisted of children whose fathers were wage earners and gmall business men. Group C was composed of children from a Hebrew Orphan Asylum with no real home environment. Children were tested and compared as to the number who tested at. above or below the norm for their age. The A group was found to rank highest, C group next, and B group last. The investigators state, "Judging from the results, environment does not seem to affect greatly mental capacity. if at all." Instead of schools ranking A.B and C as might have been expected, the C group or Jewish Orphanage ranked a close second to the wealthy school. Questions of race entered largely into the study as the children of the Asylum were all Jewish. while those of A group were predominantly American, with a few Germans, Jews and Italians, and B group was composed largely of Germans. Italians and some American children. It is very evident, as the investigators say, that in order to judge family differences in environmental influences among groups, the conditions within each group must be uniform, and the same races must be judged.

Yerkes and Anderson (18) report a study of children of differing social status. Two schools were compared; 54 children from kindergarten and first grade in School A were compared with children of the same sex and approximately the

- 58 -

same age from School B.

School A is located in a good neighborhood and the sociological status of almost all the pupils is very good. School B is located in a medium to poor section of the city, and the majority of its pupils live in a rather poor environment. The average number of points scored in the two schools is indicated in the following table:

Age						
4 yrs.	5 yrs.	6 yrs.	7 yrs.	8 yrs		
15	27	42	49	56		
17	22	29	35	41		
	4 yrs. 15 17	Age 4 yrs. 5 yrs. 15 27 17 22	Age 4 yrs. 5 yrs. 6 yrs. 15 27 42 17 22 29	Age           4 yrs.         5 yrs.         6 yrs.         7 yrs.           15         27         42         49           17         22         29         35		

The favored school averages much higher except in the 4-year group. The very young children of the unfavored group seem to have the advantage here, probably because they are less timid. The results show that there is a difference of from 20 to 30 per cent in mental ability which may be associated with differences in sociological status. The authors point out that in view of a difference so marked between children of different social levels, it is unfair to judge them by the same norm and that further investigating should be done

- 59 -

with view to establishing norms for different social levels.

Bridges and Coler (19) report a rather important study similar to that of Yerkes and Anderson. The study was made on 301 children from two schools in very different localities. School A, the favored one, is in a good residence district near a university. There are good lawns and play-grounds. The school building is modern and has inside toilet facilities. All the children were of English-speaking parents, whose occupations were mostly of business or professional nature. School B is in poor locality, a factory district situated near a railroad. Houses average 4 or 5 rooms, and are often in a bad state of repair. This district was formerly in a flood. Houses rent for \$8 to \$10 per month. Wards are muddy and ill-kept. School is old and ill-kept. does not have inside toilet facilities. Fathers of these children receive low and irregular wages. About one-half belong to unskilled labor class; remainder are in the more skilled trades or are teamsters or delivery men. Mothers often work at factory or laundry work in order to supplement the family income. All children of first and second grades were examined. The investigators found that the favored school was from 21 to 32 per cent superior to the unfavored school. varying with chronological age. The results of this investigation agreed in a striking way with that of Yerkes and Anderson. The investigators compare the children of the oc-

🗳 60 🛶

cupational groups in various ways. The general results are seen in the following table:

Occupation	No.	Av.Chron.Age	Av.Mental Age	C.M.A.
Professional	<b>3</b> 2	7 yrs.3 mo.	9 yrs.8 mo.	1.48
Traveling Salesmen	39	7 yrs.6 mo	9 yrs.2 mo.	1.26
Proprietors, etc.	34	7 yrs.10 mo	. 9 yrs.l mo.	1.21
Skilled	63	8 <del>yr</del> s. O mo	7 yrs.10 mo	. 1.12
Unskilled	60	8 <b>yrs.</b> 0 mo	7 yrs. 1 mo	83

Thus, it will be seen by the above table that the children of parents who have "favored" occupations rate higher in intelligence than the progeny of parents who have "unfavored" occupations. This seems to lend support to the theory that the elements which go to make for any given intelligence. status are transmissible from parent to offspring. Snother striking point in these findings is that of the increase of mental status as chronological age decreases. That is, there is a gradual increase of chronological age from the children of the most favored group to those of the least favored, and following with this, a gradual decrease in mental age from the highest in the children of the most favored group to the lowest in the least favored group. The correlation between intelligence and ability to show a certain level of human efficiency cannot be doubted according to the results of this investigation.

Arlitt (20) found results which agree substantially with those of other investigators. 191 children of Americanborn white parents were examined. They were divided into five groups according to the occupation of the parents. Two groups (semi-skilled and unskilled labor) were amalgamated. The median (.Q.) of the four groups were, (1) professional 125 (2) semi-professional and higher business 118,(3) skilled labor 107, (4) semi-skilled and unskilled labor 92. Pressey and Ralston (21) report results on children classified according to the occupation of father as follows: 85 per cent of the children of professional men score above median for total group; 68 per cent of the children of executives; 41 per cent of the children of artisans; and 39 per cent of the children of laborers.

Pressey (22) found the same gradations in the mental status of children classified according to the occupation of the parents as in the previously mentioned study of Pressey and Ralston. She contends that differences in intelligence are differences in native endowment, and not the result of culture arienvironment, and that there is some general factor (presumably some general mental endowment) independent of the particular tests used, with respect to which groups differ.

- 62 -

Kornhauser (23) reports a slightly different form of investigation. He made a comparative study of the financial standing of parents as indicated by the possession of telephones(a significant index of economic status) and the intelligence of their children. One thousand school children chosen at random were distributed in these divisions: (a) Retarded -- those whose actual grade in school was one year or more under the normal grade. assuming regular promotion of one whole grade each year from the age of six years on: (b) Normal--those who were at grade; (c) Advanced--those whose actual grade was one year or more above the normal. The distribution was as follows: retarded 29 per cent: normal 52.5 per cent; advanced 18.5 per cent. The families of the same thousand children were subscribers to telephone service in the following proportions; families of retarded children. 56 telephones or 19.3 per cent (of the total telephones); Normal, 168 or 32 per cent; advanced, 92 or 49.7 per cent. By the simple association Formula of Yule, the positive coefficient of correlation between the intelligence of school children and the possession of telephones by their families was found to be .61.

Paterson (24) made a survey of the school population of a Kansas town of 2500 inhabitants. The town is a railroad center and is divided into an east and a west side by the railroad, East of the tracks are the homes of the laboring class, mostly railway trainmen and shop mechanics. West of

the tracks live the business and professional classes. The results for the east side school and for the west-side school were calculated and presented separately. Using the percentile method, the median indices for the six grades of the east side school ranged from 32 to 52.5 with the median index for all the children at 45, while those for the corresponding grades in the west side school ranged from 49 to 70, and the median for all the children was 59. While the grades were distributed into five classes of ability (dull, backward, normal, bright, very bright), the distribution among the children of the laboring class was markedly skewed toward the left (lower grades of mentality) while the curve of the children of business and professional classes was skewed to the right. The writer maintains that the findings are measures of native endowment, relatively uninfluenced by social or economic forces. He contends that the inferior, mental ability of children found in poor social surroundings is not due to the social factors involved, but to the mental inferiority of the parent Pressey and Thomas (25) found that in a comparison stocks. of children of parents from a good farming district and a poor farming district that the former average higher in intelligence status. Using the norm of city children as a constant point of comparison, 20 per cent of the children from the poor district rate above the median of the city children as compared with 36 per cent in the good district; 6 per cent in poorer district score above the 75 percentile for city children as compared with 11 per cent in the better dis-

- 64 -

trict: 48 per cent in the poorer district rate below the 25 percentile for the city children as compared with 28 per cent in the better district. Johnson (41) maintains that in such matters as regularity of employment, promotion, and search for employees, selective factors are at work. The individual gravitates to the place in life that is suited to his inherited traits. His contention would seem to be true if one considers the findings of Toops (42). He concludes that the percentage of feeble-minded and borderline cases in one employment bureau is about 58.5 and that only 12.8 are normal. There seems to be a distinct relationship between the mentality and the industrial class to which a man belongs, the "unemployed" class ranking highest followed in order by the "casuals", the "odd job" men and the "unemployables". No men of normal mentality were found in the "unemployable" class.

Although representing slightly different lines of attack, the opinion of Johnson and the investigation of Toops show in a singular fashion how those factors in the individual that make him unable to compete on equal terms with his fellows, are in evidence economically and socially.

There are several facts clear from the foregoing data. First, almost all of the studies that have been cited are in agreement on the correlation between the social or economic status of the individual, no matter

- 65 -

what criteria are used to designate this status, and the innate endowment of these individuals. Or where objective evidences, social or economic, show the individual or group to be of superior status, there is an accompanying superiority of native endowment as measured by objective methods. And there are noticeable gradations from the highest to the lowest status. Second, though not directly expressed. it is to be inferred that in whatever stratification the individual or group chances to fall that such a placement is based on the germinal factors involved. Third, whether or not the ability to become a skilled laborer or a professional man is the result of transmission by the Mendelian unit from parent to offspring is beside the point. The studies have in each case demonstrated the continuity of some factor from parent to child. that is the chief determiner of what the child will become. Of course, because the term "Teamster" is designative of the economic or social status of the parent, it does not follow of necessity that the child will become a teamster, but the child in his capacity is the result of the role that inheritance plays in the individual, and by reason of a capacity not large enough to become: anything better he will gravitate to the general occupational grouping into which teamsters fall. Fourth, like Weintrob and Weintrob the investigators are in general agreement that

environment does not play a very great role in making the results favorable or unfavorable for the group studied. Finally, the numerous researches have taken different criteria (social and economic) to indicate the degree of human efficiency of the group. Assuming the transmission of parental qualities to the offspring, the children have been examined. In each case, gradations in the innate capacities, as measured by school retardation and tests, have been noticed which bear relatively a one-to-one relationship to the status of human efficiency shown by the parents. Our original thesis seems to be upheld by the facts of these investigations, that the degree of human efficiency is inevitably related to the degree of general intelligence, and general intelligence or the capacity to develop intelligence is based on inborn transmitted traits.

## DEPENDENCY AND HUMAN EFFICIENCY.

From these data there are several considerations important in a general theory of dependency. At first sight, it seems almost possible to isolate a certain portion of the normal curve of distribution, as Miner(26) has done in the case of estimating the per cent of mental deficiency in the population and call that portion of the curve the per cent of potential dependents in the population. That the dependent is an individual weak in original endowment is a point which needs no argument, if our foregoing data are considere. Of course, there are all sorts of dependents from the vegetative idiot and others of the ill who need permanent custodial care, to those who have mlative independence, but are under the directive influence of some agency. These facts do not, however, vitiate our results. In any case the type of dependency is only a matter of degree of human efficiency, the vegetative idiot showing zero efficiency and the others increasing increment by increment until the higher types of dependents are manifest, the kind of dependency and the degree of dependency decreasing at all times as the innate endowment and consequent human efficiency increases.

That selective factors are at work in a rather complex civilization needs no argument. It may be assumed as a safe hypothesis that those who attain the maximum of success, or attain the highest point of human efficiency do so by reason of superior innate ability, while those who gravitate to the other extreme do so because of inability to cope with the complexities of a better social or economic status. The capacity for a high degree of human efficiency in inferiors is poor, and necessarily the poorer this factor the more dependent this group becomes. We are not presuming to draw an absolute cleavage line

- 68 -
between those who are and those who are not dependent. It is doubtful if this will ever be possible, but we do maintain that the fundamental consideration for the study of the problem of dependency is one of human efficiency, and that scientific ameliorative work can not be done aside from the consideration of this point.

In these days one hears a variety of excuses as they relate to the individual. "Never had a chance". "Did not get an education", "Did not have a pull", "Lived in a poor environment", are some of the more orthodox expressions used as excusing a low degree of human efficiency. Granting that these may be factors in individual and exceptional cases, our theory is not invalidated by such contentions. No matter by what criteria the status of human efficiency is judged, investigations show an astounding agreement between these criteria and what the individual is inherently. Those who live on poor farm land do so because of efficiency too low to attain something better: and individual is a skilled laborer and not a professional man because his ability to be efficient places him in the skilled labor class, and so on ad infinitum. Further, the facts of heredity are carried out because the capacity for a certain degree of efficiency is continued in the children of school age, the children of those who are highest in efficiency, socially, and economically, being highest in

- 69 -

intelligence, and so on down the scale to the lowest. As previously stated, it is difficult to draw a line of cleavage between those who are, and those who are not dependent. Even so, if our other facts are true, no matter what the contributing social factors are to dependency, it seems plausible to reason that those who are dependent represent a class who succumb to inevitable dependency either naturally or by some precipitating cause (perhaps a social situation) too complex for a simple type of inherent make-up. We have previously mentioned responsibility and its relation to intelligence status. It might be argued that children are dependent because of death, divorce, desertion, or other social reasons. This at first seems true, but what of many who never become dependent, and yet who are sufferers from the same social phenomena as the dependent ones? It comes back to our original statement of responsibility and irresponsibility. Those who represent the lower end of the intelligence curve do not have the capacity for a high degree of responsibility. If social causes are prevalent which break the home or scatter the members of a family the children are shunted off to be cared for by society. What is the cause? Sherlock (27) concludes that defectiveness of feelings is more or less proportionate to the degree of feeble-mindedness. Even in the elementary processes involved in feelings and especially those involved in responsibility for others, the question of human

- 70 -

efficiency enters. Hence, the parents and those related to the children do not feel the responsibility for the care of the children, and they become part of the dependent group. Further, especially in the cases where children are left without care because of death, it is doubtful if the economic status of relatives would permit the taking of an added burden of homeless children. That is, the element of inferiority which contributes to the human efficiency of the parents of the child is also persistent in relatives of the child. The relatives, because of a low degree of human efficiency, are unable to assume the extra burden of others.

# SPECIFIC STUDIES SHOWING INFERIORITY OF DEPENDENTS.

Several important studies have been made on the intelligence status of dependents. These studies all relate to dependency in the strictest sense, that is, including those who are helped or supported by charitable agencies, and excludes the blind, deaf and delinquents. Most studies have been made on dependent children. Only a few studies are available on dependent adults. On the following page we reproduce a table from Pintner (28) summarizing the results of the major investigations made on dependent children.

- 71 -

Author	No. Examine d	F.M.	Back- ward	Normal	Above Normal	Institution
Stenquist and		•				
Others (29)	256	18.5	62.0	19.0	0.5	County Homes.
Pintner (30)	106	5.7	46.2	34.9	13.2	A County Home
Hall (31)	2142	6.7				25 Child- Caring Insti-
Williams (32)	150	6.0	32.5	49.5	12.0	4 Homes for Children
Carlisle (33) Carligle (33)	141 117	9.4 9.4				Orphan Asylum House of Good Shepherd
Terman and Wag-						
Ner(34)	68	6.0	29	53.0	12	Orphan Asylum
Haines (35)	270	17.0				Orphanages.
Mateer (36)	1603	33.7	3.9	13.8	0.6	34 County Chil ren'ä Homes
Pintner (30)	82	19.5	39.0	36.6		Selected Clin- ic Group
Bridgman (37)	13 <b>3</b>	26.0	40.0	34.0		Selected Clin- ic Group
	T		T		3	1

The following brief summary of work on adult dependents, after Pintner, is also enlightening.

Grane(38) 3334 cases in 79 county infirmaries interviewed and 21 per cent estimated feeble-minded.

Brigger(44) 25 repeaters at Associated Charities tested and 24 per cent diagnosed as feeble-minded.

Haines(35) 385 inmates of county poor farms examined and 36.6 per cent diagnosed as feeble-minded.

In the study made by Mateer on dependent children. there are in addition 46.8 per cent of cases diagnosed as potentially feeble-minded, or else "deferred diagnosis". In the case of Pintner's study of the selected clinic group 4.9 per cent were diagnosed as doubtful. These reports vary greatly in their percentages, probably due to factors of melection, different methods of diagnosis, and other condi-However, granting that in all phases the reports are tions. not reliable, these data are at least significant so far as the present study is concerned. They show definitely the type of child with which organizations have to deal in cases of dependency. If we should negate altogether the terms used in the table, viz., feeble-minded and backward, and use simply the term inferiority to denote those who are in some measure below the normal classification, we find that approximately 76.5 of the cases, in the seven studies in which data are available on both feeble-mindedness and backwardness, show definite inferiority. This includes also the cases of Mateer and of Pintner which have been mentioned. previously as not fitting into the diagnostic categories of the table. Even in these instances the different diagnostic categories do not invalidate our per cent of those who are inferior, because at least they are not normal cases. The 46.8 per cent reported by Mateer as cases of potential feeblemindedness and deferred diagnosis evidently show some factors

- 73 -

that place them without the group of normals. And what is true of Mateer's study is also true of Pintner's, that is, his doubtful cases represent a group that can not be called normal. Pintner criticizes Mateer's percentage of feeble-mindedness among dependents as being too much at variance with other investigations. This may be true, but for our purposes this fact does not invalidate our contentions. Whether feeblep mindedness or backwardness is used as the category makes no difference. The cases at least represent inferiority.

If we make computations from the table, using only the seven studies in which diagnosis are made of feeblemindedness and backwardness, and neglecting the categories of Mateer and of Pintner which do not fit into the table, we find that 45.5 per cent of the seven investigations show definite inferiority. Obviously this can not be correct, inasmuch as in the cases of Mateer and Pintager we do not know what number of cases were potentially feeble-minded and on what number the diagnoses were deferred, and for what reason. Also, in the cases of doubt as to diagnosis, we do not know the factors for the doubt. It may have been doubt as to backwardness or feeble-mindedness, or normal and backwardness, of they may have been psychopaths or what not.

Notwithstanding these discrepancies the percentages are rather significant of the type of case which

- 74 -

generally comes to be dependent, and if data were available on all eleven studies made, showing degree of inferiority, etc., we might come to some conclusions with regard to the relative degree of inferiority among dependents.

With reference to the work done on adult dependents only statements with reference to feeble-mindedness are available, no reference being made to those who are backward. On this point, however, one might speculate that if, as these investigations show, there is an average of about 27.2 per cent of feeble-mindedness among adult dependents, there would be at least 50 per cent who were inferior. It might also be mentioned in this connection that it is probably these very types of adults many of whom are not in custody, that are responsible for the offspring that become dependent.

From these data then we conclude, as before, that the relationship between inferiority and dependency is very close, the common factor of deficiency running through the group. These data are inadequate, but in general our hypothesis is substantiated, that dependency is a problem that is closely allied to the general fundamental factor of inherited predispositions in the form of inborn original weaknesses.

Using a slightly different technique than mental tests to ascertain the relationship between dependency and

- 75 -

school retardation Beard (39) found that, in the Minneapolis schools, out of each 100 pupils in the normal group (those who were in the right grade for their age) 18 will be retarded, while out of each 100 children of dependent families, approximately 31 will be retarded. She concludes that dependency has some vital connection with school retardation.

Barnes (40) on observations of homeless men in New York City estimates that 50 to 60 per cent of these types who never retain jobs, return again and again to charity organizations for aid, and who as a rule hold nothing but casual jobs, are morons.

Specific conclusions have been mentioned at varied intervals as they relate to our data. Researches both in effort to ascertain the degree of intelligence as it relates to human efficiency, and also those studies that are made of dependents themselves seem to uphold our general thesis that the problem of dependency is one connected fundamentally with germinal qualities; that the transmission of these qualities makes for a certain type of inherently weak individuals that is potentially dependent.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1. Goddard, H.H. Human Efficiency and Levels of Intelligence 1920.
- 8. Johnson, G.E. Contribution to the Psychology and Pedagogy of Feeble-minded Children. Pedagogical Seminary, 1895, Vol. III.
- 3. Wylie, R.T. Taste and Reaction Time of Feeble-Minded. Journal of Psycho-Asthenics. 1900, Vol. IV.
- . \_\_\_\_\_. A Study of the Senses of the Feeble-Minded. Journal of Psycho-Asthenics. 1900. Vol. IV.
- 5. \_\_\_\_\_. Motor Ability and Control of Feeble-Minded. Journal of Psycho-Asthenics. 1901, Vol. V.
- 6. Kelley, R.L. Psycho-Physical Tests of Normal and Abnormal Children. Psychological Review, 1903. Vol. X.
- 7. Norsworthy, N. The Psychology of Mentally Deficient Children. Archives of Psychology. Columbia University, 1906.
- 8. Pressey, S.L. and Teter, G.F. A Comparison of Colored and White Children by Means of a Group-Scale of Intelligence. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1919. Vol. III.
- 9. Woodworth, R.S. Comparative Psychology of Races. Psychological Bulletin, 1916, Vol. XIII.
- 10.Garth, T.R. The Results of Some Tests on Full and Mixed Blood Indians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1921, Vol.V.
- 11. Hunter, W.S. and Sommermier, E. The Relation of the Degree of Indian Blood to Score on the Otis Intelligence Test. Psychological Bulletin. 1921, Vol.XVIII
- 12. Decroly, O. and Degand, Mile. La Mesure de l'intelligence chez les enfants normaux d'apres les tests de MM. Binet et Simon. Archives de Psychologie, 1910, Vol.IX
- ·13.Binet and Simon, Th., Nouvelles recherches sur la Mesuré du Niveau Intellectual chez les enfants d'ecole. L'annee Psychologique, 1911, Vol. XVIII
- 14. Morle, M. L'influence de l'etat social sur le degre' de l'intelligence des enfants. Bull. Soc. libre Educ Psychol. de l'enfant. 1911. Vol. XII

- 15. Hoffman, A. Vergleichende Intelligenzprüfungen an Vorschulen und Volkschulen. Zsch. f. Angew. Psychol. 1914, Vol. VIII
- 16. Strong, A.C. 350 White and Colored Children Measured by the Binet-Simon Measuring Scale of Intelligence; a Comparative Study. Pedagogical Seminary, 1913 Vol. XX.
- 17. Weintrob, J. and Weintrob, R. The Influence of Environment on Mental Ability as Shown by the Binet-Simon Tests. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1912 Vol. III.
- 18. Yerkes, R. and Anderson, H. The Importance of Social Status as Indicated by the Results of the Point Scale Method of Measuring Mental Capacity. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1915, Vol. VI.
- 19. Bridges, J.W. and Coler, L.E. The Relation of Intelligence to Social Status. Psychological Review, 1917. Val. XXIV.
- 20. Arlitt, A.H. On the Need for Caution in Establishing Race Norms. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1921 Vol. V.
- 21. Pressey, S.L. and Ralston, R. The Relation of General Intelligence of School Children to the Occupation of the Father. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1919, Vol. III.
- 22. Pressey, L.W. The Influence of (a) Inadequate Schooling and (b) Poor Environment upon Results with Tests of Intelligence. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1920, Vol. IV.
- 23. Kornhauser, A.H. Economic Standing of Parents and the Intelligence of Children. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1918, Vol. IX.
- 24. Paterson, D.G. A Mental Survey of the School Population of a Kansas Town. School and Society, 1918, Vol.VII
- 25. Pressey, S.L. and Thomas, J.B. A Study of Country Children in (1) a Good and (2) a Poor Farming District by Means of a Group Scale of Intelligence. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1919. Vol. III.

26. Miner, J.B. Deficiency and Delinquency. 1918.

- 28. Pintner, R. Intelligence Testing. 1923
- 29. Stenquist, J.L., Thorndike, E.L. and Trabue, M.R., The Intellectual Status of Children Who are public Charges. Archives of Psychology, Columbia University, 1915.
- 30. Pintner, R. The Mentality of the Dependent Child, etc. Jourl of Educational Psychology, 1917, Vol. VIII.
- 31. Hall, G.E. Mental Examinations. Eugenics and Welfare. Bulletin, No. 11, State Board of Charities, N.Y.
- 32. Williams, J.H. The Intelligence of Orphan Children, Surveys in Mental Deviation. State Board of Charities and Correction, California.
- 33. Carlisle, C.L. The Causes of Dependency Based on a Survey of Oneida County. Eugenics and Social Welfare Bulletin, No. 15, State Board of Charities, N.Y
- 34. Terman, L.M. and Wagner, D. Intelligence Quotients of 68 Children in a California Orphanage. Journal of Delinquency, 1918, Vol. III.
- 35. Haines, T.H. Mississippi Mental Deficiency Survey, Miss. Mental Hygiene Comm.
- 36. Mateer, F. The Bureau of Juvenile Research, Ohio Board of Administration, Publication No. 19
- 37. Bridgman, B. An Experimental Study of Abnormal Children with Special Reference to Problems of Dependency and Delinquency. University of California Publications in Psychology. Vol. III, No.1.
- 38. Crane, H.W. Report on Feeble-Mindeaness, Epilepsy and Insanity in Michigan, Lansing, Michigan.
- 39. Beard, M.K. The Relation Between Dependency and Retardation. Research Publications of the University of Minnesota. Vol. VIII, No.1.
- 40. Barnes, C.B. Feeble-mindedness as a Cause for Homelessmess/ Training School Bulletin, 1916, Vol. XIII.
- 41. Johnston, R.H. The Distribution of Wealth as a Eugenist Sees it. Social Hygiene. 1921, Vol. VII

- 42. Toops, H.A. The Mentality of Men Seeking Employment Through a Public Employment Office. Master of Arts Thesis, 1917.
- 43. MoDougall, W. Is America Safe for Democracy? 1921
- 44. Brigger, G. A Study of Twenty-Five Repeaters at the Associated Charities, Portland, Oregon. Journal of Delinquency, 1916, Vol. I.

### CHAPTER IV.

# BIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF DEPENDENCY.

No discussion of the problem of dependency would be complete without some reference being made to significant biological factors that are concerned in the problem. No one can discount, especially since the researches of Darwin, Wallace and others, the importance of biological principles in human development.

Previous discussion has dealt largely with the facts of a civilization from simple to complex, and the social factors in this civilization that have seemed to give rise to the problem of dependency. Further, it has been shown, by citation of numerous investigations, that human efficiency is intimately related with germinal qualities, that those who are the products of superior germinal qualities tend to reach the highest degrees of human efficiency, and on this same basis gradations take place down the scale to those who are the products of poor germinal qualities, this fact being of the most fundamental importance in our study of dependency.

But can such facts be correlated with the facts of evolution, and are there any underlying biological principles that would account for gradations of human efficiency such as we have mentioned?

# VARIATION AND SELECTION.

About some of the principles in the evolutionary process there may be some confusion, but about two main principles upon which the evolutionary process depends there is no doubt. These are <u>variation</u> and <u>selection</u>. Whether we speak of nations, social groups, animal classifications, or what not, these two factors lie at the basis of the rise and fall, supremacy and decline of any phase of existence in which evolution or dissolution plays a. role.

Variation has been defined as "the occurrence of individuals differing from the type proper to their race of species." That there are both refined and gross individual differences, no one will question. These differences may be of two sorts, those that are resultant from modifications of the individual by the environment, and those that are innate, which are germinal in origin and which are capable of being transmitted to subsequent offspring. In general variations are of two types, progressive and retrogressive. By the former term is meant the individual who has greater potential energy and power of adaptation, who is more capable of withstanding the struggle for existence, and who has the best chance for surviving in human progress. The variation may take

the form of a special capacity in the individual by which he can acquire some particularly advantageous quality. In general, however, progressive variations can be taken to connote an increased adaptability or vitality, a greater power of making the most of the environment. The term retrogressive is a pathological one. It results in the individual of decreased potential energy and ability to adapt. Such variations imply those who are unable to meet the strain of life and are commonly termed "unfit". It may give rise to a variety of social phenomena, but on the whole the chief characteristic is simply a diminished ability to adapt and function adequately in an exacting environment. It is shown in either a defective mind or body or both, and one may be correlated with the other. It is interesting to note in this connection that the mentally deficient are, as a class inferior to the normal, in weight, stature, and general physical development. Hollingworth (1) says, in summarizing the work of such men as Goddard (2), Doll (4) and others that, "When curves of physical growth are plotted from measurements of hundreds of feeble-minded children, and are then compared with curves of growth for children chosen at random, it is always found that the former average shorter and lighter than the latter, age for age. It is seen furthermore that the differences increase with the increase in

- 83 -

the degree of mental defect. Morons are slightly below the average for normals, imbeciles are below morons, and idiots are lowest of all."

From an evolutionary point of view the human mind is the latest and most delicate achievement. Its complexity is marvelous and harmonious working of its every part is essential. It is not surprising then that a pathological condition of the germ plasm should be accompanied by disorder of the mind, disorder in this case being taken in the broader sense.

Disorders may be of various kinds. It may be a diminution of nervous vigor giving rise to such phenomena as leafers, paupers and ne'er-do-wells. It may be unstable giving rise to neurasthenia, epilepsy, and insanity. It may be such as to render the individual incapable of conforming to society's moral and legal codes, giving rise to such problems as criminality and moral imbecility. Lastly, there may be an arrest of development, with accompanying idiocy, imbecility, and other types of feeble-mindedness. It is obvious after a discussion of the two forms of variation that the first is necessary to the progress of a group of nation, while the second form of variation is inimical to any form of progress.

In our previous discussion of human efficiency and its relation to germinal qualities, it seems that the fundamental facts of biology, variation in this case, are

- 84 -

substantiatory and in agreement without hypothesis that dependency is a phenomenon fundamentally based on retrogressive variation, the products of such variation becoming unfit because of poor innate energy and powers of adaptation. That there is a relationship between the degree of human efficiency and the innate capacity of the individual, investigations leave no doubt.

Elaborating on this, if we accept Stern's (5) definition of intelligence that, "Intelligence is a general capacity of an individual consciously to adjust his thinking to new requirements; it is general mental adaptability to new problems and conditions of life," then the connection between human efficiency as related to general intelligence and this in turn to retrogressive variation is clarified greatly.

Add to the specific way in which biology upholds our thesis we need only refer to what has already been stated in this connection. In the retrogressive type of variation the power of adaptation in the individual is diminished (in varying degrees). Since general intelligence by definition is an adaptive process, then in cases where the individual is a case of retrogressive variation the general intelligence would be weak or low, depending on the seriousness of the variation. Human efficiency, as we have already seen, is connected with general intelligence so that dependency being a problem in human efficiency

- 85 -

of a rather low order, the problem of dependency becomes one of retrogressive variation, at least in part.

But there is another process in evolution, namely. selection. It may act in two ways, either through a differential birth rate or a differential mortality rate. There is no evidence, except in the case of idiots who are usually sterile, that the unfit are naturally less fertile. Indeed, if the contentions of McDougall (6) are true, the inferior members reproduce at a more prolific rate than do the normals and superiors. He says, "A strong inverse correlation of the birth-rate with social status seems to be general throughout the European hations". What is true of Europe is also true of America, the inferior element in the population reproduces much more rapidly than the superior element. A study made in Pittsburgh seems to be fairly typical of conditions in general. McDougall quotes Popence and Johnson ( 7 ) on this point as follows. "Ward 7 has the lowest birth-rate and the lowest rate of net increase of any ward in the city. With this may be contrasted the Sixth Ward. Nearly 3000 of its 14,817 males of voting age are illiterate. Its death-rate is the highest in the city. Almost name-tenths of its residents are either foreigners or the children of foreigners Its birth-rate is three times that of the Seventh Ward. Taking into account all the wards of the city, it is found that the

- 86 -

birth-rate rises as one considers the wards which are marked by large foreign population, illiteracy, poverty, and a high death rate. The correlation between illiteracy and net increase is 4.731. The net increase of Pittsburgh's population, therefore, is greatest where the percentage of foreigh-born and of illiterates is greatest. Pittsburgh. like probably all large cities in civilized countries. breeds from the bottom. The lower a class is in the scale of intelligence, the greater is its reproductive contribution." Authorities seem to be in agreement on the point that procreation among those of inferior stock is far more prolific than in the average or superior of the general population. About twenty years ago, Pearson (9) summarized the problem in the following statement: speaking of England he says," Our birth-rate has been going down for perhaps thirty years. Who will venture to assert that this decreased fertility has occurred in the inferior stock? On the contrary, is it not the feckless and improvident who have large families? The professional classes, the trading classes, the substantial and provident working classes-shortly, the capable elements of the community with a certain standard of life -- have been marrying late, have been having small families, have been increasing their individual comforts, all this at the expense of the nation's future."

Goddard (3) more recently in his study of the Kallikaks is of the opinion that those of inferior stock

- 87 -

reproduce at a much faster rate than the average or superior of the population. Sanger (10) in arguing for birth-control contends that the feeble-minded parent is many times more prolific than the normal parent. She states that 95 per cent of prostitutes are mentally deficient and come from large families. With such evidence presented, both by actual data and by those who have studied the situation carefully, it cannot be doubted that the greater rate at which the unfit are being multiplied forms a problem of no small consequence both in relation to dependency and other social phenomena.

We have already, in another connection, discussed how, because of a growingly complex civilization, those who were inadequate or could not survive in the struggle for existence were shunted off to become dependent on the community and cared for by the community. This represents one form of selection. This process of selection was not concerned so much with those who had obvious physical defects, these being cared for in another manner.

In the early stages of civilization, both in Greece and Rome up to the time of Valentinian, the delicate and deformed children were killed. With growth of civilization, and especially with the advent of Christianity, the practise of infanticide was foregone. The life and safety of the individual was not so much dependent on brute

- 88 -

strength as on mental capacity. Civilization changed the mode of life from the wide open country to the density of group life. Therein the process of selection had its opportunity to work. People were thrown together in groups of Varying size, and consequent upon this came unsanitary conditions. With poor sanitary conditions came also disease. It is generally believed that it is this factor that has been active in the selective process in relation to the population. The theory is that, although disease strikes both the fit and unfit, that the latter by reason of weaker constitution and less resistance succumb to disease. On this point, some social theorists believe that because those who are inferior have a higher mortality rate than the normal or superior, this has an equalizing or balancing effect between these two extremes. That is, the fact that the inferior of the population procreate more rapidly than the normal and superior should not be looked upon with fear because the sturdiness of the normal and superior stock as against the weakness of the inferior stock, making for greater resistance in the case of the former and higher mortality in the case of the latter, tends to make the number who survive of about equal number at both extremes. From data available on the mortality rate of the feebleminded as contrasted with the mortality rate of the outside population, it would seem that selection does tend to work in

- 89 -

this manner. Miner (8) says, "The average annual death rate among the institutional cases of feeble-minded 5 years of age and over in the United States in 1910 was 35.29 per thousand, while the corresponding death rate in the general population of the registration area for five years 1901 - 1904 was 13.56." However, these figures must not be taken with too much credence.

It must be remembered that the figures with relation to those inferior are representative alone of the feeble-minded and of those in custody, and can searcely be taken as reliable for those outside of institutions and of the vast class of inferiors that are not feeble-minded. If the Army data are to be taken as criteria of the amount of inferiority, and as indicative of the germinal element in the population, then it does not seem plausible to believe that the contention of social theorists, with reference to the equalizing effect of higher mortality among inferiors, can be taken with much seriousness.

Therefore, there is every reason to believe that the process of selection is an important one in relation to dependency. For, while by differential birth rate the inferiors are producing more rapidly the type that have the potential basis for dependency, than the normals and superiors, the number who survive in both extremes is not equalized by a differential mortality rate.

- 90 -

# DEPENDENCY A BIOLOGICAL PHENOMENON.

We have considered how by the processes of variation and selection the fit are selected and the unfit rejected.

Two factors seem to be important in the role which biology plays in the problem of dependency. On the one hand, dependency seems to be inevitably the result of retrogressive variations that have occurred in the progress of civilization. The dependent is weak in original innate tendencies, the result of a defective germinal element. On the other hand, selection working as it has in the population has not struck a balance between the two elements in the population, inferiors at one extreme and normals and superiors at the other. Despite higher mortality rates among inferiors this lack of balance has tended to increase the number of individual possibilities for dependency, Civilization as it has increased more and more in complexity has tended to shunt off increasing numbers of the inherently unfit, making them subject to the benevolence of the community, thus giving rise to the social problem known as dependency.

Viewed as a general or specific problem, dependency of any kind cannot be linked primarily to economic or other such causes. Although these factors precipitate dependency, they are not the real causes. The cause, in the majority of instances, lies in the inherent weakness of

- 91 -

the individual due to factors already discussed.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY.

• - - • \_

- 1. Hollingworth, L.S. The Psychology of Subnormal Children. 1922.
- 2. Goddard, H.H. The Height and Weight of Feeble-Minded Children in American Institutions. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases. 1912.
- 3. \_ The Kallikak Family, 1912.
- 4. Doll, E.A. Anthropometry as an Aid to Mental Diagnosis. The Training School Bulletin. 1916.
- 5. Stern, W. (translated by G.M. Whipple) Psychological Methods of Testing Intelligence. 1914.
- 6. McDougall, W. Is America Safe for Democracy? 1921
- 7. Popence, P. and Johnson, R.H. Applied Rugenics. 1918

8. Miner, J.B. Deficiency and Delinquency. 1918.

- 9. Pearson, K. National Life from the Standpoint of Science. 1901.
- 10. Sanger, M.H. The Case of Birth Control. 1917.

#### CHAPTER V

- 93 -

# THE EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION.

Research work that has been done on the factors involved in making a prognosis, favorable or otherwise, on any type of case is decidedly meager. Most mediums for the handling of social problems purport to do follow-up work on their cases, but so far as the writer is aware, the methods of such agencies are decidedly hit-and-miss. None of the data that have accrued from the experience of such agencies have been analyzed or published. Undoubtedly, there would be much of value in such information. The chief motivating principle of any agency is in so far as possible, rehabilitation, or, in other words, to make the individual an independent, self-respecting member of society. Unless it is known what the factors are that make for the success or failure of the individual, then much ameliorative effort is misspent.

Pintner and Reamer (1) made one study of 26 girls (delinguent) who had been committed to the Big Sisters Home until suitable placing could be found for them. The authors conclude that "considering the cases as divided into two groups, normal and backward, we find that the backward group is just as likely to make good as the normal." "Our study lacks a sound objective criterion by which to measure success in the world. Owing to the circumstances the emphasis was laid upon moral behavior. This is undoubtedly, to a very great extent, a condition dependent upon the environment, and it would seem that the type of girl studied, whether normal or backward in intelligence, has not the ability to protect herself against an unfavorable environment."

"In regard to the practical situation of the relationship between the psychological clinic and the social worker, the writer regards these results as significant. It would seem that the child diagnosed as backward by our scales has as much chance of making good in same sphere or other as the child diagnosed as normal. The backward as well as the normal ought, therefore, to be referred to such homes and agencies without giving either the preference. It may be that the backward child succeeds because the social agencies may have a greater number of simple positions that would be suitable for such cases and which might be of doubtful value for more intelligent individuals".

Clark (2) does not agree with Pintner and Reamer that intelligence is not necessarily prognostic of success. On a study of 301 cases (all boys), 247 of whom had had mental examinations, he found that there was a general tendency for bogs of higher intelligence to fall into the "doing well" group and of boys of lower intelligence to fall into the "doing poorly" group. (Clark makes a threefold category as a basis for judging success of the boys,

- 94 -

vis., doing well, doing fairly well, and doing poorly). He found also that white and Mexican-Indian boys have a slightly better record of success than the colored boys. Clark hints at some relationship existing between occupation of the boy and success. On this point he draws no definite conclusions.

From these two studies, no final deductions can be made, because the studies themselves are inconclusive. So many conditions enter into the cuestion of what is to be considered success and failure. The criteria seem to differ with the difference in the individual problems to be solved. In the case of Pintner and Reamer the criterian moral behavior and in Clark's study emphasis is placed on the occupational aspect. These two studies give no groundwork for any assumptions as to factors that can be used in prognosing success of the individual case. Even on the main issue, the factor of general intelligence, the two investigators differ, so that so far as being worth-while as a basis for establishing a specific theory of prognosis, the two studies are almost without value only in so far as they show the immensity of the whole problem.

DEFINITION OF DEPENDENCY IN THE PRESENT STUDY.

The process by which children become dependent wards of the State has already been discussed in another connection in Chapter I. For purposes of clarity, as our

- 95 -

data relate to the problem of dependency in the present chapter. we have adopted the definition of dependency set forth in Section 1645 of the General Code of the State of Ohio. A dependent is defined as. "any child under eighteen years of age who is dependent upon the public for support; or who is destitute, homeless or abandoned; or who has not proper parental care or guardianship; or who begs or receives alms; or who is given away or disposed of in any employment. service, exhibition, occupation, or vocation contrary to any law of this state; who is found living in a house of ill-fame or with any vicious or disreputable persons, or whose home by reason of neglect, cruelty or depravity on the part of its parents, step-parent or other person in whose care it may be is an unfit place for such child; or is prevented from receiving proper education because of the conduct or neglect of its parent, step-parent guardian or other person in whose care it may be, or whose environment is such as to warrant the state in the interest of the child, in assuming its guardianship."

In this connection, it must be kept in mind that previously dependency has been discussed in a very general sense. As seen from a legal point of view, the present definition becomes a techinal one. That is, the process that causes dependency is specific in the present instance, this representing one of several categories of general dependency. However, the fact of specificity in this chapter in no way alters the discussion of previous chapters. Causes and conditions, are the same whether the discussion relates to the general social problem of dependency, or dependent children as viewed from the standpoint of the present chapter.

#### THE CHILDREN STUDIED.

All the children included in the various phases of this investigation were wards of the State of Ohio as provided by law and under the direct jurisdiction of the Division of Charities. Effort was made to use all of the cases that had been referred to the Bureau of Juvenike Rewearch for examination, but this was found impossible because a large number of the examinations had been made by the workers of the Bureau in various County Children's Homes and were simply "surveys" conducted by the Bureau at the request of the Division of Charities. Again. in many instances it was found necessary to use groups of varying size. Despite an effort to keep a certain standardized procedure in our method of follow-up, many of the data called for in the follow-up blanks were not given, so that it became necessary when any one set of facts was being studied, to use only those cases on which follow-up blanks were complete for that detail. Hence, the differing size of the various groups in relation to different sets of facts. No mention will be made in this connection of the varying sizes of the groups. Of course,

many of the cases were used in more than one group, but obviously from our previous statement, it became impossible to use one group in relation to all points studied. In connection with each set of facts, the number of cases will be given.

All of the cases used had both psychological data from the Bureau of Juvenile Research and follow-up data from the Division of Charities.

# POSSIBILITY OF SELECTION.

While the factor of selection might enter somewhat into the present study due to the smallness of the groups, yet as far as the results are reliable, we do not believe that there will be any serious invalidation of them for the reason that when any factor was being studied the cases represented an absolutely random selection, and were were in no sense chosen to substantiate a certain point. They were used because of fata present on a certain point, and for no other reason.

THE METHOD USED.

Exhibits I and II show in detail the method used in this investigation. Effort was made in gathering data from the Bureau to anticipate and summarize only those points in each case that were of primordial importance in making a prognosis on an individual case from a psycholog-

ical point of view. The blank for Bureau data was not made so elaborate as the blank for the Division of Charities for the reason that all data from the Bureau were abstracted by the writer and one other worker who understood the nature of the study and the kind of data required. In compiling the blank for the Division of Charities we endeavored by using the multiple choice scheme rather fully to obtain more or less specific facts on each case of follow-up and reduce the personal equation to a minimum. This blank was submitted, with the name of the child on whom the follow-up was to be made, to the Director of Child-Care, of the Division of Charities, and in turn the blanks were redistributed by him to the workers who were in charge of the various children. The data were for the most part obtained by the worker handling the child. Limitations of the method are discussed in another section of this work.

# ECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE.

For this portion of the study, 220 cases were avaliable on which the economic status of the parent of the child was designated by the terms, pauper, unskilled laborer, etc. The intelligence rating of the child was also available. The following table shows the relationship between the economic status of the parent and the

- 99 -

intelligence of the children, using the Intelligence Quotient as a criterion of intelligence.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·											B	-L
Economic Status			-	Totals	Z							
	30- 39	40- 49	50- 59	60- 69	70-	80- 89	90-  99	100-	110- 119	120- 129		
Pauper(1)	0	0	2	3	2	7	1	1	1	0	17 Av.I. <b>G</b> .81.9	7.1
Unskilled Labor (20	1	1	6	18	34	49	32	13	7	lı	162 Av.I.Q.84.1	78.
Skilled Labor(3)	0	0	0	7	2	16	10	2	1	ο	<b>3</b> 8 ▲v.I.Q.85.2	17.
Small Busi ness Man(4)	) 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3 A.T. I.Q.95.0	1.
Totals	1	1	8	28	38	73	44	17	•	Ĩ	220	

TABLE I

Seferal facts are at once observable from this table. First, the modal point of intelligence in each separate group of dependents is between 80 and 89 I.Q.; second, 67.7 per cent of the entire 220 cases is dull normal or below in intelligence(this is based on Terman's assumption that 80 to 90 I.Q. is significant of dull normal intelligence); third, 81.3 per cent of the 220 cases are offspring of parents whose economic ratings are low; fourth, the average Intelligen Quotients of the four groups show some gradations; fifth, the correlation between economic status of the parents and the intelligence of the children based on Pearson's Product-Moment formula is  $r = \pm .31$  P.E. =  $\pm .0405$ .

In this latter computation the assumption was made that 1.,2,3 and 4, were the numerical ratings for the different degrees of economic ability ranging from Pauper 1 to Small Business Man 4.

Lastly, there is a noticeable variability in the gradation of per cents in the four groups with reference to the number that rate as dull normal or below in intelligence. Of the children of paupers 82.3 per cent are dull normal or belowy of the children of unskilled laborers 67.3 per cent; of the children of skilled laborers 65.7 per cent; and of the children of small business men 33.3 per cent. These per cents are based on the portions of the 220 cases who fell in the various economic classifications and not on the whole number of cases.

Viewing these facts in any light, one cannot help but see that the indications point to a verification of our postulate, namely, that the dependent child is one in whom there is the taint of hereditary inferiority. Admittedly, not all of the points in our statistical study of economic status and intelligence bear this out, but the preponderance of fact is decidedly in favor of our postulate.

One chief unfortunate point in this whole portion

of our study is that we were limited to 220 cases. Aside from one group, the children of unskilled laborers, the number of cases in no sense represents a number from which conclusions can be drawn. And yet, it can be maintained as highly significant that out of 220 cases. 73.6 per cent of the group are children of unskilled laborers. Even if we discount the fact of intelligence, there remains another consideration, namely, this group represents a number that for some reason, either intelligence or some other factor. have been, in our competitive life, shunted off to the Lower levels of human efficiency. That is, it is the class represented by the unskilled laborer that has been most potent in the problem of the dependent child. This would seem to follow well the theory that the dependent is one in whom the hereditary impetus to progress is poor.

Another fact which strongly substantiates our postulate is in the per cent of the total number of cases that show inferiority. We have already stated that 67.7 per cent of the entire group are below par in intelligence. Aside from the immediate and obvious significance of this noteworthy inferiority of dependent children, whom we have every reason to believe will not rise high in the social and economic scale; is the fact of the seeming continuity of this inferiority. The problem is, of course, essentially a biological one, but in so far as intelligence measurements are worth-while indications of the type of

-102-

individual that becomes dependent, the problem is a psychological one also. It is to be remembered that these children who represent the major portion of our 220 cases are for the most part offspring of those who by other criteria are also inferior. The continuity of inferiority obtains in the sense that these inferiors carry in their germinal qualities the elements for procreating future inferiors and dependents. Four-fifths of our 220 cases represent children of parents whose economic rating is low, and hence, whose place in the scale of human efficiency is also low. This point seems to bear out our previous statement of the persistance and continuity of inferiority in dependent children, that they represent a social problem the chief characteristic of which is unfitness for competitive life; the rate low in the scale of human efficiency, and must be cared for by society as dependents.

The gradation of averages in the Intelligence Quotients is only suggestive, and the small measure of difference between the four classes is probably due to the poor distribution of cases. The  $\pm = \pm .31$  is also suggestive, but not a true measure of the relationship between economic status and intelligence. This again is probably due to the small number of cases onwhich the relationship was measured. At least, however, it is suggestive of some relationship, and reveals a problem which should have some further consideration, especially

-103-

when other facts already mentioned are considered. The basis for our statement that this coefficient of correlation is not truly representative of the relationship is based on the higher degree of relationship found by other investigators already discussed.

# MENTAL RETARDATION AMONG DEPENDENTS.

In this connection 220 cases were used and the amount of retardation tabulated in terms of months with the frequency for each measure. The table shows this clearly. In the retarded group were 193 cases.

		Х	enta <b>l</b>						
0-5	6-11	12-17	18-23	24-29	30-35	36-41	42-47	48-53	54-5 <b>9</b>
18	86	23	28	17	20	15 1	12	12	6
60-65	66-71	72-77	78 <b>-8</b> 8	84-89	90-95	96-101	102-107	108-113	114-119
7	8	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	1

TABLE IIa.

Those who were "normal" or mentally accelerated are comparatively small in number and are shown by the following table. In this group there were 27 cases.
TABLE	II	Ъ	•
-------	----	---	---

	Normal or Mental Acceleration in Months.										
*	0	0-5	6-11	12-17	18-23						
	4	6	9	б	3						

The distribution of Chronological Ages in which the retardation obtained may be seen in the following table.

## TABLE IIC.

Frequency of Retardation for Chronological Age.											
\$-3"	4-4"	5- 5 <sup>#</sup>	<b>6-</b> 6"	7-7*	8-8"	9-9 <sup>n</sup>	10-10"	11-11"	12-12"	13-13"	14-
2	4	11	11	4	11	13	17	13	14	14	79

As is shown by Table IIb, the number of cases showing "normal" or accelerated intelligence level is small, only 27 in number. However, for purposes of clarity the Chronological Ages in which the intelligence was normal or advanced is shown in the following table and the frequencies tabulated for each measure.

### TABLE IId.

	Frequency of Normal and Accelerated for Chronological Age.										
3-3"	<b>4</b> -4"	5-5"	6-6"	<b>7</b> -7 "	8-8"	9-9"	10-10"	11-11"	1 <b>2-</b> 12"	13-13"	14-
0	3	3	4	2	3	1	0	1	0	l	9

The table on the following page shows the actual Chronological Ages of the subjects, stated in terms of years; the frequencies of retardations are plotted for each of these ages in multiples of six months, that is ranging from 0-5 to 114-119 months.

In all cases where the subject was 14 years of age as in Table IIe, these have been plotted under the 14 year group in our tables. The Intelligence Quotients and retardation or acceleration of such subjects has also been computed on the "14-year hypothesis".

Of the 220 cases studied 87.7 per cent show inferiority of Varying degrees. This has been studied in a variety of connections and is presented in the foregoing in tabular form.

Only 12.3 per cent of our cases show normal or accelerated intelligence. From Table IIa we see that the median retardation for the 193 cases of inferiority is 32.23 months. From the distribution in Table IIc the median Chronological Age of retardation is 12.75 years. The cases which preponderate in this distribution are those at M4 years of age and above, all of which have been plotted in the 14 year category for reasons previously mentioned. Table IIc shows not only the retardation of dependents for the various Chronological Ages, but also amplifies somewhat Table IIc in that it shows the frequency of retardation for increasing six month periods. A study of this table shows that approximately 42 per cent of the retarded cases have a retardation

TABLE	IIe	ø
-------	-----	---

Retardation in Months																		
	0- 5	6- 11	12- 17	18- 23	2 <b>4</b> - 29	30- 35	36- 41	42- 47	48- 53	54- 59	60- 65	66- 71	72- 77	78-84 83 8	-90-96- 9 95 10	102-108-114- 1 107 113 119		To tal
17	1	1			daga sa										н <del>а (</del> 2014 - 2014) - 2014 - 201	n na an an an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna Anna.	<u>Paripanen</u>	2
17	2	1	1															· <b>4</b>
Ħ	3	5	1	2														11
n n	1	5	5															11
1		1	l	1			1	*						<b>.</b>	,			4
1		3	2	3	1	נ	. 1											11
1	1	3	5	1		י ב		. 1	l									13
, <b>17</b>	4	1	3	3	3	נ	. 1		1					•				17
11	2	l	1	3	3		l		2	-				N				13
) TI		1	- 	2	1	3	52	5		-								14
511	3	1 3	5	2 11	2 7	2 12	2	2 4	1 8	]	L 7	2	3	1 1	1	:	1	14 79
	17	26	24	28	17	20	15	12	13		57	2	3	2	1		1	193

-101-

equal to or greater than the median retardation for the entire group of 193 cases.

As we have only 27 cases that show normal or accelerated intelligence no study has been made of these other than to tabulate them for purposes of lucidity.

The significance of the facts presented in the mental retardation of dependent subjects hardly meeds mention. One most astounding feature shown by our tables is the prependerance of inferiority shown in the 220 cases studied to be 87.7 per cent. It seems that our main thesis is supported largely by this finding. Without entering into the arguments as to what are the factors in general intelligence, the dependent undoubtedly is proven to be inferior in that "something" which tests purport to measure. We have already shown previously that whether, in truth, tests measure intelligence or another factor or factors or whether the individual is high, medium or low in what is measured, can be used as a basis for predicting the degree of human efficiency that the individual will show.

One might object to some of these conclusions by saying that our data show 12.3 per cent who are normal or accelerated in intelligence. However, in handling the general problem of dependency one cannot reason from exception. It is logical to believe that perhaps there are other factors entering into the reason for these cases becoming dependent. In the light of our previous statements, and if inheritance

-108-

plays the role that we believe, the parents of these children must remain an unsolved problem because our data do not lend themselves to specific treatment of this kind, that is, ascertaining the heredity of the particular 27 cases who are normal or above.

Another fact which is strongly indicative of the group which tends to become dependent, is revealed in that 42 percent of the whole group of inferiors equal or exceed in retardation the median retardation of the group. This seems not only to point out that society must support retarded children, but also gives some general idea of the seriousness of the retardation. Undoubtedly some of the 193 cases will become self-supporting at a rather low economic level, but the fact that 42 per cent equal or exceed a retardation of about two and one-half years would seem to show that many will always be dependent even as adulta. perhaps even in many instances institutional cases. While only a very rough indication, yet as a general index of the seriousness of retardation as a factor in dependency, one might subtract the median retardation of the group from the median Chronological Age of the same group. The result would be a Mental Age of slightly more than 10 years. Assuming the typical dependent to be of not more than 10 years mentality, what is to be expected? The chief point is this: we can no longer talk knowingly of the social factors in dependency. The basis of dependency is to be found elsewhere. and that, in an inherent unfitness which makes him very logically a dependent.

### ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL FACTORS.

Apropos to the fact that most considerations of the causes of dependency deal primarily with social factors involved, an attempt has been made in the present study to make an analysis of such factors. For the most part such an analysis is extremely unsatisfactory as will hereinafter appear. While it is possible, in many instances, to isolate per se certain unitary social factors as the causes of dependency, on the other hand there are many cases where such an assumption is impossible because of the complexity of the social factors themselves. Further, as will appear later, all of these factors are so annexed to other more fundamental conditions in dependency that the so-called essaial causes of dependency become in themselves merely the objective symptoms or results of a condition inherent in the types of individuals who become dependent.

We have analyzed 227 cases in this study. This was the number on which the data were clear and complete, and which at the same time could be subjected to statistical treatment. Those cases which did not fulfill these requirements were discarded. The number discarded was not large enough to seriously invalidate the statistical results on

-110-

the cases studied. That is, the cases discarded were not select in any one factor or set of factors. Hence, the cases used represent within the limits of the number studied a random sampling of all the social causative factors in dependency, the same as if the whole number, including discards, had been used. However, the cases <u>are select</u> in the sense that, being dependent children, they are the very best group fromwhich to study social causative factors.

The method of gathering data was from question 1, under II. Character and Behavior, in our follow-up questionmaire (See Exhibit II) submitted to the Division of Charities. As our analysis progressed it was found feasible to use in conjunction with this first question, question 5, under I. Environment. The purpose of using these two questions together will become clearer later. The first of these two questions is:

Is child a ward because of : (Check term which applies).

()Parental neglect, ()Broken Home,
 ()Inability to adjust. Illegitimacy,
 The second of these two questions is:

Is home broken? (Check term or terms which apply).

()Father dead ()Mother dead. ()Both parents dead.
()Divorce ()Separation. ()Immorality.
In each of these questions, the social worker for the Division of Charities was expected to do as directed, that is, merely check the factor or factors in each question that applied

to the individual whose case was being followed. At this juncture it is important to make clear what was expected in the different categories in question 1, under II. Character and Behavior. Effort was made to align as far as possible all the circumstances which might be assigned as unitary causes of dependency. An analysis of our data which follows later will show how ill-advised it was in the present study to attempt to isolate any single factor or group of such factors as unitary causes of dependency. Social factors are by no means mutually exclusive. There is much overlapping. For example, it is impossible to assign parental neglect as a unitary cause, because this fact, which may be stated as the reason for a dependent child, may be complicated with another factor which we have designated as broken home. Again, parental neglect may be associated also with illegitimacy. as a cause of dependency.

Not only have we the foregoing to say in criticism of our method of follow-up, but also, as our analysis progressed we found that aside from the normal social causes of dependency, there may be in the differing categories, what we shall term, for want of a more adequate name, abnormal social causes.

With relation to normal circumstances of dependency, there are assigned social causes which are totally extrinsic to the child, as in the case where the child is

-112-

left without support by the death of both parents. Such cases, of course, fall into the category of those who are dependent because of a broken home, and the factors in-volved are normal.

Again, there are those cases in which the child is made dependent because of the death of one parent, and the consequent inability of the remaining parent (mother in most cases) to support the child. This would also fit into our category of broken home as the cause of the dependency, and the circumstances would be normal. However, on the other hand, it does not follow that in all cases where one parent is deceased that the cause of dependency is a normal one. The cause may be abnormal in the sense that patental neglect must be considered as the chief factor in dependency. The surviving parent may wilfully shirk responsibility in caring for the child. In such cases the causal factors are undoubtedly abnormal.

Referring again to parental neglect, not only may we have such cases as have already bben mentioned, but there may be dependency resulting from economic inefficiency of both parents, or shiftlessness. In either case it would be a mooted question as to whether the causes were normal or abnormal. Explanations might be multiplied. However, we have cited enough examples to show clearly the complications into which one is thrown when an analysis of

-113-

social causes of dependency is attempted. In order to make clearer the various contentions advanced in this analysis. as previously stated, we have used data collected from question 5, under I. Environment. Originally, no attempt of this kind was contemplated, but an example will show why we have resorted to this method. For example, of the 227 cases studied. 51 were reported as being state wards (dependents, strictly speaking) because of parental neglect. On first thought, such cases would seem to be those in which parents have simply shirked responsi lility for the support of the child, by throwing the burden on society. Such, however, is not the case. As a matter of fact, the factor of parental neglect is shown by our data to be coupled with many other factors of wide variability, ranging from cases in which the mother is deceased, the assumption being that the father is guilty of neglect in these cases, to other instances of association of parental neglect with divorce, separation and immorality.

While our method of statistical analysis may seem irregular, since the original purpose of the follow-up inquiry was to have been different, it seems that our statistical results show enough consistency to warrant the procedure which we have adopted, and to make the method perfectly valid. The type of analysis adopted does not lend itself to tabular form, hence we have stated on the following page in outline the results of the analysis of social factors.

### I. Parental Neglect.

Neglect by mother after father's death 7 CABOB Neglect by father after mother's death 14 cases Neglect due to divorce 1 case Neglect due to separation ll cases Neglect due to immorality 8 cases Neglect due to both separation and immorality 3 CASES Neglect by mother after father's death; also report of immorality on part of mother 7 cases Neglect by both parents; both reported to be in the infirmary 1 case Neglect by both parents on account of being physically incapacitated 2 Cases Neglect because of economic inefficiency of parents 2 cases

Total, 56 cases

About 24.7 per cent of the 227 cases are reported as dependent because of parental neglect. With regard to what has already been said concerning unitary factors, a glance at the table will suffice to show how impossible is the isolation of one factor. Only five cases are clear-cut cases of parental neglect; all others are complicated in one way and another This would leave 51 cases for which with other factors. some explanation must be made. Assuming that the seven cases reported as neglected by the mother after the father's death. were not true cases of parental neglect but rather inability of the mother to provide; further, assuming the same thing for the seven cases reported as neglected by the mother who is also reported immoral, there are still 35 of the 51 cases for which some accounting must be made. In previous chapters we have repeatedly emphasized the element of human efficiency in relation to the problem of dependency. Part of human efficiency, in fact, the first function of human efficiency

of high order is to care for one's own. If these data are at all revealing, then the indications are that dependent children are produced by a group in which the role of human efficiency is of low order showing socially in the neglect of their children. The logical construction to be put on these 37 cases just mentioned, is that they are dependent, not primarily as a result of social causes, but because of a fundamental and inherent dearth in the individuals of whom they are the progeny--a potentially inferior type-who produce the same kind of children and who are incapable of full social responsibility for their offspring for reasons already mentioned.

II. Inability to Adjust.

In this category for follow-up purposes, the motive was to ascertain the number of cases that became dependent because of factors inherent in the individual. Statement has already been made of some of these possible types. As a matter of fact, even with a full history of the case, it is very often difficult to solve whether a wardship is due to (in maladjusted cases) actual anamalies in the individual or in the home. In this category not enough cases were reported to make any findings reliable or valid. Many of the dependents on whom psychological studies had been made had been differentiated as unstable types. It was thought that some study of the correlation between the psychological diagnosis and the factors in the

-116-

maladjustment of the individual would be possible. The plan was not feasible. A total of only 7 cases were reported as dependent because of inability to adjust. Only 3 of these cases are differentiated as dependent solely, because of this, while 3 cases are complicated with separation of the parents, and one with the father's death and immorality on the part of the mother. Hence, no analysis of this cate-

gory is undertaken.

#### III. Broken Home.

Dependent after mother's death18 casesDependent after death of both parents24 casesDependent after divorce3 casesDependent after separation14 casesDependent after immorality2 casesDependent after separation and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality4 casesDependent after father's death and immorality4 casesDependency complicated with death of parents,5 cases	Dependent afte:	father's death	8	Case 8
Dependent after death of both parents24 casesDependent after divorce3 casesDependent after separation14 casesDependent after immorality2 casesDependent after separation and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality4 casesDependency complicated with death of parents,4 casesdivorce, separation, and immoralitya mis-5 cases	Dependent afte:	: mother's death	18	08.8 <b>8 8</b>
Dependent after divorce3 casesDependent after separation14 casesDependent after immorality2 casesDependent after separation and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality4 casesDependency complicated with death of parents,4 casesdivorce, separation, and immoralitya mis-5 cases	Dependent after	death of both parents	24	08888
Dependent after separation14 casesDependent after immorality2 casesDependent after separation and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality4 casesDependency complicated with death of parents,4 casesdivorce, separation, and immoralitya mis-5 cases	Dependent after	divorce	3	08.8 <b>9 8</b>
Dependent after immorality2 casesDependent after separation and immorality3 casesDependent after father's death and immorality4 casesDependency complicated with death of parents,4 casesdivorce, separation, and immoralitya mis-5 cases	Dependent after	separation	14	08665
Dependent after separation and immorality 3 cases Dependent after father's death and immorality on mother's part 4 cases Dependency complicated with death of parents, divorce, separation, and immoralitya mis- 5 cases	Dependent after	' immorality	2	08. SO 8
on mother's part 4 cases Dependency complicated with death of parents, divorce, separation, and immoralitya mis- 5 cases	Dependent after Dependent after	eparation and immorality father's death and immorality	3	08.5 <b>8 8</b>
Dependency completeated with death of parents, divorce, separation, and immoralitya mis- S cases	on mother's par	· <b>t</b>	4	08.50 8
divorce, separation, and immoralitya mis- 5 cases	Dependency com	dicated with death of parents,		
	divorce, separa	tion, and immoralitya mis-	. 8	08.50 5
cellaneous group	cellaneous grou	.p	<b>bt</b> ik <b>-</b> par	

Total.

79 Cases

The group in which dependency is ascribed to the broken home forms the largest single category of our 227 cases, consisting of 79 cases or about 34.8 per cent. Commenting on this table it will be noticed that 24 of the 79 cases that are reported as dependent because of the broken home, this breaking of the home has been due to the death of both parents. It might be argued that such an instance is the only normal circumstance under which a home can be broken. That is, even in the 8 cases where the home is broken because

of the father's death, and the 18 cases because of the mother's is it not plausible to assume that there are also possible factors of parental neglect? And without doubt, every other factor mentioned in the table as being a contributing factor to the broken home is of a decidedly abnormal nature. abnormal in the sense that it forms an outlet of too little importance to be used as a fundamental cause of dependency. Viewing the matter candidly, divorce, separation and other factors in the table are only symptoms. Socially they may be stated as the reason for the broken hom and the consequent dependency resulting thereform. But there is a more fundamental wrong present, when progeny will be shunted off to the care of society because of such reasons. Progeny who become dependent are the unfortunate wictims of parents whose natures follow a line of least resistance. To recapitulate somewhat, even in the instance of the 24 cases whose dependency is assigned to the broken home because of death of both parents, there is another side to the story. Most families and parents, even of average standard, make some provision within reason, by the use of fraternal organizations, insurance and so on, for care of their offspring in case of parental death. What of these 24 cases? The average family would not even so much as entertain the thought of their children ever becoming dependent wards of the state. They would deem it disgraceful. Again, in many cases relatives of one or the other

-118-

of the parents respond to the need of totally orphaned children. With all of these normal possibilities of normal care of parentless offspring, and others which might be mentioned, it seems reasonable to argue that even in circumstances where children are dependent because of a broken home consequent from the death of both parents, the parents represent a type of a decidedly inferior strain. One might argue that in such cases a manifestiation of ability to assume obligation is indicative of intelligence. That is, such parents have failed to make provision for offspring even up to the standard of the average, and having failed in this respect they show indications of a social inferiority, Briefly, then, to return to our basic thesis, such parents are low in the scale of human efficiency. With reference to other types of broken homes, even in the cases where the home is broken from death of one or other of the parents, as previously stated, these cases may be coupled with the factor of parental neglect or, to add another possibility, economic inefficiency on the part of the surviving parent. However, in any case, our fundamental argument seems to be upheld, that such facts stated as causes of dependency are actually symptoms of inferiority. Therefore, children of such parents become dependent not because of any of the mentioned social factors, but actually and factually because of this same inferiority, functioning as a negated social responsibility for their

-119-

children. An inspection of any of the other causes of the broken home will show practically the same facts in substantiation of our argument on dependency as a problem in inferiority or low human efficiency. In other words, it is not within the realm of reason to assume that separation, divorce, and other such social causes, even if ascribed as reasons for the broken home, would cause both parents (if even of the average) to willingly negate the responsibility of providing through normal channels proper care for their children if left orphans.

IV. Illegitimacy.

Dependency on basis of immorality alone 20 cases Dependency on basis of separation and immorality 4 cases Miscellaneous instances of illegitimacy after father's death, separation, etc. 4 cases Total. 28 cases

Little need be said concerning illegitimacy as a cause of dependency. This has received some treatment in a previous connection. Again, we can only point out the fact that illegitimacy is a symptom and hot a cause. The fact that illegitimate children are in the world bespeaks a condition which must have a reason other than mere chance. Our contention is that the illegitimate child is in the vast majority of cases inferior, and the offspring of inferior individuals. We have already cited the study of Wooley and Weidensall in which they find 40 to 45 per cent of unmarried mothers institutional cases. Those who lean

to a social explanation of dependency might argue that there are cases of illegitimacy that do not become dependent. We have no quarrel with such a statement. However, in such cases might it not also be contended that, inasmuch as there are those who have illegitimate children that do not become dependent, this would be a measure of the superiority of such individuals. In other words, human efficiency would function highly in such cases. We have no means of knowing even conjecturally how many such cases there are, but such a statement used as an argument against our fundamental postulate, that dependency is a problem in low human efficiency or inferiority, would seem, in the light of fact to substantiate our hypothesis rather than refute it. We knowthat so far as any researches have shown anything, that illegitimate children are the progeny of inferior parents, and it seems a safe contention that the major portion of our 28 cases cited as dependent would fall in a category of not only inferior children, but the progeny of inferior parents.

V. Parental Neglect + Inability to Adjust.

Only one of our 22% cases falls in this group. In this instance, separation is complicated with other facts. We have no means of knowing whether separation or something inherent in the individual is responsible for the dependency. Hence, no analysis is attempted.

-121-

VI. Parental Neglect + Broken Home.

Dependent after mother's death	8	Cases
Dependent after death of both parents	1	C8.80
Dependent after divorce	3	Cases
Dependent after separation	9	C8.588
Dependent after separation and immorality	5	Ca 88 8
Dependency associated with mother's death and		
immorality	4	08.508
Dependency associated with divorce, separation		
and immorality	5	08.508
Miscellaneous	1	C8.89
Total States	76	00.00.0

It has already been stated that to disregard the fact of parental neglect in connection with certain factors causing the broken home is difficult. In a fairly large number of cases. 36 in number, the child was reported as dependent because of the combination of the two factors. The subject of parental responsibility has already been treated fully in connection with other categories, and suggestion has been made as to its function in human efficiency. A study of this table merely reinforces our prevaous contentions. The combined category reported as a cause of dependency is simply a social symptom of low human efficiency, in which divorce, separation, death of a parent, and so on act as the precipitating conditions for these symptoms. The symptoms themselves are not causations on which to base dependency, but truly objective aspects of basic inferiority. Children are dependent not because of parental neglect plus a broken home, but because the individuals who are responsible for them are of that type

of human efficiency which is too low in functioning to assume the responsibilities of parenthood.

VII. Parental Neglect + Illegitimacy.

Dependent because of immorality 6 crases Dependent because father dead and immorality on part of mother l case Dependent because of separation and immorality <u>l case</u> Total, 8 cases

Much has already been said on the fact of both parental neglect and illegitimacy as causes of dependency. In this table is included a small number of the 227 cases in which the factor of parental neglect is complicated by illegitimacy. Which factor is dominant as the cause of the dependency is difficult to say. As we have considered both factors in our previous discussion, both are symptoms of inferiority. To assign either of the two as a cause for dependency is to assign a symptom as a cause. In other words, taken separately or in combination, these two factors are only agents of a more basic and inherent condition through which children become dependent.

VIII. Inability to Adjust + Broken Home.

Dependency following mother's death	4	08.89 8
Dependency following father's death, also	Ŭ	04.000
immoral conduct stated	2	Cases
ration stated in report	2	08.80 8

### Total. 11 cases

In this combined category there is no means of telling

whether inability to adjust, that is facts inherent in the individual, or the broken home is to be regarded as the major cause of the dependency. In four of the cases, the inability of the child to adjust to the father may be the reason for dependency, or the factors to be considered may be those in the father. With the remaining number, the facts are complicated by such things as divorce, separation, and immoral conduct. Because of the unreliability of the data. no analysis is attempted.

### IX. Parental Neglect + Inability to Adjust + Illegitimacy.

In this combined category only one case falls. The definite contributing cause to the category is stated as immorality. No other data are available and no analysis is attempted.

### SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL FACTORS.

In many respects the analysis of social factors in dependency is limited and crude. Moreover, the analysis does not purport to be conclusive. It is, however, highly suggestive and propadeutic to the theory of dependency profounded at length throughout this study. The method of analysis by category, although somewhat more lengthy than another form might have been, has been used because it tends to show not only the simple unitary causes and their combination for dependency, but also the facts which contributed to these categories. That is, it is more enlightening to know that there are 14 cases where the mother is dead and the children are dependent because of parental neglect due to the mother's death than to know that such and such a number of cases are dependent simply because of parental neglect. A simple statement of a unitary social cause is many times misleading. The method of analysis which is used here enables one to see the fact back of the social cause.

In the majority of instances, as will be seen from statements following each table, the inference drawn, though not conclusive, but which can be taken as strongly positive evidence. is that social causes are not in themselves the actual reasons for dependency. They are indications only, and must be analyzed in the light of the facts which are responsible for the social cause. When this is done, it is impossible to agree with the sociologist that the social cause alone is responsible for dependency. Admitting some doubt in some instances with regard to inferiority as the fundamental cause of dependency, and we have been frank on this point, an analysis of the contributing factors seems to show a preponderance of evidence in substantiation of the concept that dependency is almost inevitably based on the degree of human efficiency possible in the individual.

OTHER DATA ON SOCIAL CAUSES OF DEPENDENCY

In a previous chapter we have discussed conditions

-125-

of general dependency aside from its technical or legal connotations. In connection with the present chapter we have attempted an analysis of social factors as reported to us for the present investigation. Howett (3) writing in The Ohio Bulletin presents an analysis in tabular form of 1981. cases running over a period of over seven years. Herewith the table is presented verbatim. Referring to the table. Mr. Howett says. "....there is no one dominant factor which causes dependency and delinquency unless it is that the home is not functioning fully in its place in our civil-The statistics given in the table are not complete. ization. or accurate enough to be used as a basis for a positive con-It seems to show conclusively that there are entireclusion. ly too many broken homes. Very few of the children are full orphans. Many of them have both parents living."

Children Received April 30, 1914, to January 1, 1928. \*PRIMARY CAUSES OF DEPENDENCY.

Classification	Number	Per cent
Both parents dead	147	7.4
Father dead	266	13.4
Mother dead	289	14.6
Parents separated	145	7.3
Foster parents separated	2	.1
Deserted by both parents	31	1.5
Deserted by father	116	5.9
Deserted by mother	76	3.8
Deserted by foster mother	l	•05

\*These causes are approximate, as "Cause of Dependency" is not always stated in Family History. In that case, it is taken from commitment or from correspondence concerning the case.

Classification	Number .	Per cent
Parents unable to care for	3	.8
Mother unable to care for	153	7.7
Father unable to care for	2	.1
Father ill	5	.3
Immorality of both parents	4	.2
Immorality of father	7	.4
Immorality of mother	69	3.4
Drunken father	10	.5
Drunken mother	5	.3
Imprisonment of father	30	1.5
Lacking parental care	116	5.9
Home unfit	45	2.3
Dependent	2	.1
Feeble-minded	5	.3
Father feeble-minded	4	.2
Mather feeble-minded	25	1.3
Insene	ĩ	.05
Father insane	6	.3
Mother insane	36	1.7
Medical treatment	15	•8
Syphilitic	6	.3
Tubercular	2	.1
Grippled	181	9.1
Deaf and dumb		.2
Speech defect	ī	.05
Father spileptic	ī	05
Mother epileptic	3	.2
Mother tubercular	3	.2
Petit Largeny	2	· .1
Delinguent	23	1.2
Incorrigible	7	.4
Immoral	2	.1
Has illegitimate child	16	.8
Supervision	51	2.6
Social problem	1	.05
Observation	9	.4
Foundling	9	.4
Surrendered by mother	1	.05
Unknown	44	2.1
Total,	198 <b>1</b>	100.0

In its general and practical aspects the foregoing table does not differ widely from our own more detailed analysis of social causes in dependency. The same categories have not been used, such as parental neglect, broken home and others, but

the factors which have contributed to these categories have been used in this table. Again, one notes the wide variability of social factors responsible for dependency. Also, one notes how the factor of social irresponsibility characterizes most of the causes that are cited in the table. Mr. Howett's conclusion that the home is not functioning adequately in our civilized life may be an explanation. But it does not seem that any of the factors taken either separately or collectively, whether used as an explanatory basis for the mal-functioning home or as primary causes of dependency, is adequate to either. It is true that these various factors may indicate that the home is not what it gught to be, but on the other hand, the home is probably all that i can be. That is, there is a fundamental virus to account for the poorly functioning home, and this is the inferior germinal element in the individuals who are cited in the table as those who permit their offspring to become dependent because of these so-called causes of de-The causes of dependency are not commensurate pendency. with the problem itself. To the social cause must be added the fundamental virus in order to make an explanation that is coextensive with the problem. This fundamental virus is inferiority. And this inferiority is manifest in the mal-functioning home, or stated in other terms, lowered human efficiency, objectified in many cases by the symptoms shown in the table.

-128-

Two aspects of analysis are undertaken in this phase of our study. In question 8, under II. Character and Behavior report was made as to whether the dependent child had tended to improve under placement. The findings from this question were analyzed in conjunction with the Intelligence Quotient of the child, and his Chronological Age at the time of becoming a ward. Complete data were available on 139 cases. In the following tables plus (+) is designative of improvement; minus (-) of no improvement.

TABLE III

Improvement	50-5 <b>9</b>	60-69	70-79	80-89	90 <b>-99</b>	100-109	110-129	120-129	Tote
+	0	7	19	3 <b>8</b>	28	8	-6	1	94
	3	6	12	16	5	3	0	0	45
Totals	3	13	31	49	33	11	. 6	1	139

Intelligence Quotient

The foregoing table shows the number at separate I.Q. intervals that show improvement under placement, and those who do not. Reducing these to a percentage, using the total number of cases at each interval (except in one instance) as a basis for computing the per cent we have the following:

I.Q.	50-59 =	0.0%	improve.
11	60-69 =	53.8%	<b>_ 11</b>
11	70-79 =	61.2"	Ħ
Ħ	80-89 -	67.3%	¥ <b>T</b>
17	90-309=	81.8%	11
11	110-119=	100. %	11
17	120-129=	100 %	Ħ

In the above table we have followed Temman's idea of classification with regard to normal or average intelligence. The cases under the two I.Q. intervals, 90-99 and 100-109 have been combined into the interval and the percentage computed on the basis of the total number of cases in these two groups.

That there is some relationship existing between actual improvement and the intelligence of the individual seems fairly evident from a study of these tables. The per cent of increase of those who improve under placement is quite gradual as the Intelligence Quotient increases. What is the significance of this? Such findings seem to show that in predicting the success or failure of a dependent child, the capacity for success is an important factor. In other words, the lower the intelligence of the individual the less favorable are his chances for success when placed, and vice versa.

If intelligence is the individual's ability to adjust his thinking to new conditions of life, and to adapt to new problems and situations, then those who have less intelligence are handicapped by a lack of capacity for this adjustment and adaptation.

-130-

Placement in its essential features merely means that the individual is faced with a certain situation to which he must adjust and adapt his thinking. Of those less capable of such demands, a smaller per cent improve because improvement is limited by ability to improve; of those more capable, a larger per cent improve because such a group has greater capacity for meeting the demands of the environment.

All other things equal, the reason for institutions for the feeble-minded is that a complex outside environment calls for capacities with which the feeble-minded are not endowed. Such individuals demand a simpler environment, one commensurate with their intelligence. Therefore, artificial conditions must be provided for them through institutional care.

Pintner's previously mentioned contention, that prediction for success or failure is dependent upon what objective criteria are used as designative of success or failure, is very timely. In the present status of sociological investigation, it is not known what constitutes the average or normal environment. Without doubt there is need for scientific enlightenment on this point. With the cases here used, the improvement or non-improvement of the dependent was left to the judgment of the social worker handling the case. But inasmuch as our results show a fairly gradual increase from those who fail wholly to meet environmental demands, to the most intelligent group that shows a 100 per cent success in this requirement, it seems plausible to assume that, at least in the essential features, environmental conditions were somewhat constant. Referring again to the element of human efficiency in the problem of dependency, here again we have the relationship between intelligence and efficiency demonstrated. Those of less intelligence manifest less human efficiency in meeting the demands of placement, while those of more intelligence show greater efficiency.

Improvement and non-improvement have been analyzed in connection with the Chronological Age of the child at the time of his becoming a ward. Results are shown in the following table:

TABLE IV.

Tmprove	Chronological Age at the Time of Becoming Ward								
ment	0-2"	3-5"	6-8"	9-11"	12-14"	15-17*	Totals		
+	9	17	20	16	28	10	94		
	1	2	6	12	17	7	45		
Totals	10	19	26	28	<b>3</b> 9	17	139		

These various Chronolgical Age intervals reduced to a percentage basis, using the total number of cases at each in-

-132-

terval as a basis for computing the per cent, shows the following results:

90.0%	of	Cases	0-2.9	years	of	age	improve.	,
88.8%	of	Cases	3-5.9	years	of	age	improve	
76.9%	of	Ca 5 <b>8 8</b>	6-8.9	years	of	age	improve	
57.2%	of	Ca. 80 8	9-11.9	years	i of	age	improve	)
56.4%	of	·cases	12-14.9	years	of	age	improve	)
58.8%	of	08.8 <b>8 5</b>	15-17.9	years	i òf	age	improve	)

From this table it would appear that the age of the child when becoming a ward is an important consideration when predicting for success or failure of the child. It is obvious that the chances of success among younger children is greater than that of older children. The decrease in per cent of those that improve is greater from 6-8.9 years to 9-11.9 years than between any other intervals. This, with the fact that those children in interval 12-14.9 years show the smallest per cent of those that improve, brings to light several important considerations and problems in child psychology. Any discussion of these points would of necessity involve much with reference to the genetic unfoldment of the child, and hence, can only be dealt with in a brief manner.

One explanation which might be vouchsafed for the noticeable prependerance of improvement among the younger children is the fact of their greater plasticity. Definite social habits have not been formed, and they are more amenable to direction and discipline. In other words, these children become wards at a period when they more or less instinctively look for some guiding agent, and because of this are better material for improving than would otherwise be the case if they were older. Because of their plasticity they adjust to placement conditions more quickly and adequately.

Two points of interest might be advanced with reference to the previously mentioned age intervals, 9-11.9 years and 12-14.9 years, both of which show a noticeable decrease in the number of those that improve. It is possible that these children have become wards at a time when certain social and moral habits have become fairly well fixed. Basing our judgment upon the fact that dependent children usually come froman inferior environment, undoubtedly some of these habits would be unacceptable in even an average environment. An effort to change them when the child is placed means coercion, which in itself is a very logical avenue for conditions of non-improvement.

Another probable contributing condition to the reason for the lower percentage of improvement among children of the above mentioned ages is the change that takes place in the physical and mental life of the child. With added years of growth, and as puberty is approached, there are many alterations that take place, structural, endocrinic, physiologic and others. The child becomes sex-conscious, individualistic and lacks conformity to moral and ethical codes. Griefly, this is the unstable period, and his conduct is of the same kind. Discipline is irksome. It may be then that much of the reason for non-improvement in these older groups can be traced to the aforementioned fac-

tors.

Of course, neither of the two factors which have been discussed as important in making a prognosis on the dependent child should be taken alone. Even though a dependent might fall within one of the younger categories, this would not necessarily mean that he had an equal chance for success with others of the same age group. In other words, the age of the individual cannot be separated from his capacity for improvement. The following table shows a correlation of the two factors that have been discussed in relation to the prognosis on dependent children.

TABLE V

C.A. at time of	Intelligence Quotient								
becom- ing ward.	50 59	60 6	- 70- - 79	80- 89	90- 99	100- 109	110- 11 <b>9</b>	120- 129	Totals
0-2"	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	l	10
3-5"	0	2	2	6	5	1	3	0	19
6-8"	2	1	6	9	5	2	1	0	26
9-11"	0	2	5	12	5	1	3	0	28
12-14"	l	б	14	13	3	3	0	0	39
15-17"	0	3	2	7	2	3	0	0	17
Totals	8	13	31	49	25	10	7	1	139

-135-

The correlation derived from these two factors, by Pearson's Product-Moment Formuda is. r= -.205 P.E. ± .05. From these data, we conclude that so far as being important as factors in predicting the improvement or non-improvement of dependent children when placed, both factors are worth much consideration because of evidence that they are mutually exclusive, and involve wholly different entities, yet both of which are germane to the success or failure of the dependent when placed. Only two of the more outstanding factors in prognosis-making on dependency have been studied. A full consideration of all the factors is without the limits of the present study, and necessitates a separate account.\* Not only is the prognosis on the dependent child involved with factors of intelligence status and Chronological Age. but it is further involved with conditions of differential diagnosis, length of wardship, and other points.

However, the limited manner in which prognostic factors have been discussed in the present study is not malapropos. A study of the elements which constitute a favorable or unfavorable prognosis is an effort to ascertain what factors are important in predicting the human efficiency of the individual.

\* The author has in the process of preparation just such a study.

-136-

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Pintmer, R. and Reamer, J. Mental Ability and Future Success of Delinquent Girls. Journal of Delinquency, 1918, Vol. III.

2. Clark, W.W. Follow-up Record of Whittier State School Boys. Whittier State School. Fourteenth Biennial Report, 1916-1918.

5. Howett, H.H. The Ohio Bulletin. Vol. XXVIII. No. 1.

### CHAPTER VI

-138-

### GENERAL SUMMARY.

In this study we have attempted an analysis of data from two different agencies, one the chief function of which is the placing of dependent children; the other psychological and other forms of examination of these same types of children. Effort has been made to correlate the findings of these two agencies.

Such a study has led logically to a consideration of the prevalent theories regarding dependency, and the causes assigned for this social phenomenon. Since dependency is, for the most part, regarded as a social problem, the chief work in ascertaining causative factors and in evolving a theory of dependency, has been done by the sociologist. While considering the biological and hereditary aspects of dependency as of some importance. the sociologist places most emphasis on socio-economic factors, and seems to find in these the apotheosis of all that must be known in order to establish a cure-all and end-all for dependency. The social theories and causes of depnedency have been reviewed in detail. Some of these have been criticized, while others have been dismissed as being of little importance in explaining dependency. In our actual investigation wa have analyzed the social factors in dependency, and have

advanced the argument that instead of being primordial causes of dependency, social factors are symptoms of a more fundamental defect that exists in the individual who becomes dependent. And this fundamental defect we maintain to be the true explanation of dependency.

Pursuant to our effort to ascertain the actual causatic elements in dependency, we have advanced a tentative theory for this phenomenon based on a thorough consideration of the various correlations known to exist (experimentally) between human efficiency, as judged by various objective criteria, and the capacity of the individual as reckoned from divers forms of intelligence measurements. Capacity in its varying degrees, and as objectified in sundry forms of human efficiency, is the result of different degrees of general intelligence. The mechanism of general intelligence, we maintain, to be heriditable.

Dependency, from this view-point, is a phenomenon the cause of which is inherent weakness in the individual. The capacity of those who become dependent is too low to cope with the exactions of complex civilized life and by selection they are shunted off to be cared for by society. So-called social causes may precipitate the inherent weakness, but cannot be used as a basic factor in explaining dependency.

The probable biological explanation of dependency

-139-

is retrogressive variation. By this process the powers of adaptation and adjustment as lowered in the individual. Selection as a biological process does not seem to equalize the number of those who are average and superior, and those that are inferior. The number that forms the group from which dependents come procreate at a consistently more rapid rate than the average or superior. Selection fails to equalize these two diametrically opposite groups. Hence, ameliorative social work in itself will not tend to decrease the bigness of the problem. Both from our own and other investigations the inferior element seems to preponderate in the dependent group. Some average and superior cases are found, but these are few in number and are not dealt with elaborately in this study. The socalled "borderline" case, in which the role of the ene vironment might be potent enough to make for dependency. in case of poor environment. or independence, in case of good environment, is not considered in our study. What constitutes borderlinity must first necessarily be established. At present this question is a philosophical one.

No attempt has been made to draw an absolute line of demarcation between dependence and independence. We have only attempted to show that dependency is a social phenomenon that cannot be explained by social causation. To the extent that specific prognostic factors have been studied, two have been differentiated as important in

-140-
the success or failure of the individual when placed. This point, however, is in need of furkher investigation.

Finally, then, dependency is a problem the cause of which is not primarily social. Social causes are secondary. Fundamentally, the facts which account for dependency are inherent in the individual. Any kind of prognosis on dependency, whether the group or the individual of the group is considered should necessarily take into account and be limited by the dependent's capacity for human efficiency and social strata from which dependents characteristically come. More specific conclusions are drawn throughout our study in connection with the consideration of different phases of the problem.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY.

Several problems have been indicated in other connections in this study. Exhibit III shows the method used by the Division of Charities for obtaining information on homes in which children are to be placed. Undoubtedly, the method is in need of much refinement. Whether the plan of the Whittier State School in grading home and neighborhood conditions is feasible or not, only research work will show. The plan of the Division of Charities for ascertaining the fitness or unfitness of a prospective environment is wholly empirical and affected strongly by the personal equation. Undoubtedly some more adequate

-141-

method should be found for rating, by means of objective criteria, the poor, average and superior environments. Methods of follow-up on individual cases of placement are also inadequate. The questionnaire method used in our investigation, while having some advantages, is also subject to the fault common to such a method, viz., the personal equation. By a more refined method of followup, empecially in the matter of rating degrees of improvement in placed cases, statistical results would be more reliable. Such an improved method would be of value not only to the field-worker in judging the status of cases in his charge, but to the psychologist as well in making predictions for success or failure of the child to be placed.

Much of the information obtained has not been treated because of the necessity of limiting the present study. As has already been intimated, the problem of dependency will lend itself to further investigation; especially on factors concerned in the prognosis.

-142-

Form 2287

# DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY The Ohio State University

## EXHIBIT I.

## DATA FROM THE BUREAU OF JUVENILE RESEARCH

1.	NameCase No
2.	C.A.at the time of examinationC.A. at this time
з.	M.ADiagnosis:Level Function
4.	Points of psychopathy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5.	Reason for examination
6.	Reactions during examination
7.	Recommendations
_	_
8.	Prognosis

9. History:-

### DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY The Ohio State University

#### EXHIBIT II

DATA FROM THE DIVISION OF CHARITIES 1. Name..... 2. Time of becoming ward..... I.ENVIRONMENT 1.( ) Country bred ( ) City bred ()Both 2. Type of home. (Check term or terms which apply.) ) Rural ) Sl111 ) Sparsely settled ) Crowded ) Factory ) Tenement ) Apartment ) Factory Residence 3. Economic Status of Family (Check term which applies.) () Pauper ) Clerical work ) Unskilled laborer ) Skilled laborer ) Small business man ) Executive ) Well-to-do ) Large business man 4. Size of family including parents. (Check number.) ()3 ()4 ()5 ()6 ()7 ()8 ()( ()10 5. Is home broken? (Cheek term or terms which apply.) ( ) Both parents dead
( ) Immorality ( ) Mother dead( ) Separation ( ) Father dead () Divorce II CHARACTER AND BEHAVIOR 1. Is child a ward because of: (Check term which applies.) ( ) Broken home( ) Illegitimacy ( ) Parental neglect ( ) Inability to adjust 2. How many times has child been placed? (Check number of times.) ()1 ()2 ()3 ()4 ()5 ()6 ()7 ()8 ()9 ()10 3. What have been the average intervals of placing? (Check number which applies.) ()1mo. ()2mo. ()3 mo. ()4 mo. ()5 mo ()6 mo. ()7mo. ()8mo. ()9 mo. ()11 mo.()12 mo. Note: If average intervals of placing are greater or less than these noted write number on the following line .....

4. Nature of offenses which led to replacement. (Check term or terms which apply.) ()Sex ()Incorrigible ()Miscellaneous..... () Theft NOTE--Do not cover points of number 4 in number 6. 5. How long did child remain placed each interval? (Check number which applies in each interval.) () 1 mo. () 2 mo. () 3 mo. () 4 mo. () 5 mo. () 6 mO () 7 mo. () 8 mo. () 9 mol () 10 mo. () 11 mo. () 12 mo lst Interval () 1 mo. () 2 mo. () 3 mo. () 4 mo. () 5 mo. () 6 mo () 7 mo. () 8 mo. () 9 mo. () 10 mo. () 11 mo. () 12 mo 2nd Interval 3rd Interval ( ) 1 mo. ( ) 2 mo ( ( ) 5 mo. ( ) 9 mo. ( ) 3 mo. () 4 mo. () 5 mo. () 6 mo ) 9 mo. () 10 mo. () 11 mo. () 12 mo () 1 mo. () 2 mo. () 3 mo. () 4 mo. () 5 mo. () 6 mo () 7 mo. () 8 mo. () 9 mo. () 10 mo. () 11 mo. () 12 mo 4th Interval ) 2 mo. ( ) 3 mo. ( ) 4 mo. ( ) 5 mo. ( ) 6 mo ) 8 mo. ( ) 9 mo. ( )10 mo. ( )11 mo. ( )12 mo 1 mo. ( 7 mo. ( 5th Interval ) 3 mo. () 4 mo. () 5 mo. () 6 mo ) 9 mo. () 10 mo. () 11 mo. () 12 mo 6th Interval () 1 mo. ( () 7 mo. ( ) 2 mo. ( ) 8 mo. ( () 1 mo. () 2 mo. () 3 mo. () 4 mo. () 5 mo. () 6 mo () 7 mo. () 8 mo. () 9 mo. () 10 mo. () 11 mo. () 12 mo 7th Interval 8th Interval () 1 mo. () 2 mo. () 3 mo. () 4 mo. () 5 mo. () 6 mo () 7 mo. () 8 mo. () 9 mo. () 10 mo. () 11 mo. () 12 mo 6. Do you ascribe the childUs maladjustment to fault of home, child, or school? (Check term which applies.) () School () Home () Child 7. Is the child the type that you would advise to be adopted? (Check the term which applies.) () Yes ( ) No . 8. What is known of the school history of the child? (Check term which applies.) ( ) Bright but truant ) Retarded D Bright and interested ) Truant ) Regular attendance but dull () Retarded and truant

() Seemingly bright but not interested

9. Has child tended to improve under placement?

() NO

() Yes

10.1f improved under placement, do you think credit is due the home or the child? (Check term which applies.)

() Home

( ) Child

11.If employed, how does child react? [Check term which applies.)

- A.( ) Works regularly
  B.( ) Works irregularly
  C.( ) Changes employment often
  D.( ) Keeps employment for long period
  E.( ) Works regularly and is employed for long period
  F.( ) Works regularly but changes employment of ten
  G.( ) Works irregularly but is employed for long period
  H(( ) Works irregularly and changes employment often
- 12. In case child is maladjusted in employment, i.e., with reference to points, B,C,F,G, and H in number 11, if fault usually due to : (Check term which applies.)

() Ohild

( ) Employer

13. Characterize reactions of child under supervision. (Check term or terms which apply.)

(	) Co-operative	( ) Non-cooperative
(	) Energetic	() Lazy
(	) Self-reliant	() Self-depreciative
(	) Modest	() Conceited
(	) Sociable	( ) Non-sociable
(	) Peaceable	( ) Quarrelsome
(	) Resentful	() Forgiving
(	) Makes friends easily	() Does not make friends easily
(	) Gregarious	( ) Seclusive
(	) Honest	( ) Dishonest
(	) Adapts quickly	( ) Does not adapt quickly
(	) Trusting	() Suspicio <b>us</b>

14.Reaction of child to criticism, correction, reprimand, rebuke, or punishment.

I ) Improvement

() Deterioration

15. Brief statement of general facts of heredity and environment not covered in this questionnaire.

## EXHIBIT III

No.....

<b>Division of Ch</b>	arities—De	partment of	Public	Welfare
-----------------------	------------	-------------	--------	---------

Oak and Ninth Streets, Columbus, Ohio

# **Report on Proposed Foster Home**

*						
Name of applicant	name)	/H	ushand'e	First)	Wife's First and Maid	
(		(11	agoand 2		WHY & FILSE BING MIBIOR	÷•• 7
Location (Street and Nu	Number or R. F. D.)		(City	or Village)	(County)	******
Rull directions for reaching home:		·				
Fun directions for reaching nome :					***************************************	
Application for: Boy Giri	Whi Colo	te red	Age	Catholic Protestant Jewish	Free Wage Adoptive	
		THE F	AMIL	Y		
Names of Members of Family at Address Stated	Age	Nationality or Race		Birthplace City and State	Occupation ar School and	nd Wage Grade
Husband						*****
wife (maiden)					*****	******
children 1						
			•			9 8 2 8 1 - 6 5 - 1 7 4 4 7 X X X A 4 4 4 4 4 4
2			-		******	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
3					******	
<u>4</u>			-			1
Other Members of Household: Relatives, Boarders, Hired Help	Age	Health	Sex	Relationship	Occupation	Nationality or Race
					*****	
					*****	***
Brief history of family: Date of mar	riage	• ** <u>*</u> * «*******************************	Place	of marriage		
Length of residence					**************************************	*****
Number of children by this marriage	,	Facts concerning t	hose no	t at home	***	*** **** =*****
		Ū				
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	======================================
Other marriages, divorces, etc						******
n an						
•						

Standing of family in community

Facts concerning foster children who have been in this home.....

THE HUSBAND	THE WIFE
Details of physical defect or illness (habits: drink, tebacce, prefanity):	Details of physical defect or illness (habits: drink, tobacco, profanity):
jung series and ser	·
 Education, intelligence, mental defect, natural refinement, personal appearance:	Education, intelligence, mental defect, natural refinement, personal appearance:
Personality, temperament, moral character, disposition:	Personality, temperament, moral character, disposition:
· · · · · ·	
4 9 <u></u>	
Member of what church, distance from home, attend regularly, take any active part:	Member of what church, distance from home, attend regularly, take any active part:
Where employed, how long, industrious, successful, pay bills promptly, entire income available for family:	Employment outside of home-special work in home-at home most of time:
Social life and fraternal connections:	Social life and fraternal connections:
<i>;</i>	

Describe the neighborhood (note any undesirable influences).

İ

### THE HOME

dow used       How much yard         .oceation and value of other property	· · ·		
ceation and value of other property	low usedHow much yard		
ooms in house Bath Automobile Special industry	ocation and value of other property		
vice stock	ooms in house	1stry	
escribe home and manner of care (cleanliness, order, comfort, sanitation) vidences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pletures) THE FOSTER CHILD Vill child be a member of the family in every respect? Duties child will be expected to perform Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone: if not, with whom? Cype of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?	ive stock		
by/dences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)	Describe home and manner of care (cleanliness, order, comfort, sanitation)		
Svidences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)         THE FOSTER CHILD         Will child be a member of the family in every respect?         Daties child will be expected to perform         Jescribe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?         Zype of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?         Probable companions and associates         Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training			
Syldences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)         THE FOSTER CHILD         Will child be a member of the family in every respect?         Duties child will be expected to perform         Duties child will be expected to perform         Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?         Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?         Probable companions and associates         Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training			
Dividences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)			
Bridences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)         THE FOSTER CHILD         Will child be a member of the family in every respect?         Duties child will be expected to perform.         Duties child will be expected to perform.         Jescribe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?         Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?         Probable companions and associates.         Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training			
Byidences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)			
Evidences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)			
THE FOSTER CHILD         Will child be a member of the family in every respect?         Duties child will be expected to perform.         Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?         Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?         Probable companions and associates.         Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training	Svidences of refinement in home (periodicals, books, music, pictures)		
THE FOSTER CHILD         Will child be a member of the family in every respect?         Duties child will be expected to perform         Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?         Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?         Probable companions and associates         Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training			
THE FOSTER CHILD Will child be a member of the family in every respect? Duties child will be expected to perform Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?			
THE FOSTER CHILD         Will child be a member of the family in every respect?         Duties child will be expected to perform.         Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?         Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?         Probable companions and associates.         Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training.	·		
THE FOSTER CHILD         Will child be a member of the family in every respect?         Duties child will be expected to perform.         Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?         Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school?         Probable companions and associates.         Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training.			
THE FOSTER CHILD Will child be a member of the family in every respect? Duties child will be expected to perform Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom? Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school? Probable companions and associates.			
THE FOSTER CHILD Will child be a member of the family in every respect? Duties child will be expected to perform Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom? Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school? Probable companions and associates. Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training.			
Will child be a member of the family in every respect? Duties child will be expected to perform Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom? Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school? Probable companions and associates	THE FOSTER CHILD		
Duties child will be expected to perform	Will child be a member of the family in every respect?		
Duties child will be expected to perform			
Duties child will be expected to perform			
Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?	Duties child will be expected to perform		
Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?			
Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom? Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school? Probable companions and associates. Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training.			
Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school? Probable companions and associates Ápplicant's ideas regarding discipline and training	Describe room where child will sleep. Will child sleep alone; if not, with whom?		
Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school? Probable companions and associates	•		
Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per year; will child be sent to high school? Probable companions and associates			
Probable companions and associates	Type of school child will attend; distance from home; number of months in session per ye	ar; will child be sent to high school	?
Probable companions and associates			
Probable companions and associates			
Probable companions and associates			
Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training	Probable companions and associates		
Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training			
Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training		•	
	Applicant's ideas regarding discipline and training	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

ere both husband and w	vife interviewed and do both desire child?	
mes and addresses of n	ersons interviewed and their opinion as to the	e desirability of placing a child in home of applicant:
•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		
<sup>1</sup> 888####\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$	······	······································
×	······	
*		
<u>.</u>		
•		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
·····		
ype of child recommend	led for this home:	
1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
ate of investigation		
ate of investigation		(Investigator)
ate of investigation		(Investigator)
ate of investigation mmary:		(Investigator)
ate of investigation		(Investigator)